

The Price
ECCLESIOLOGISM EXPOSED:

BEING

THE LETTERS

OF

“CLERICUS CONNORENSIS,”

AS

ORIGINALLY PUBLISHED

In the Belfast Commercial Chronicle.

WITH

INTRODUCTORY REMARKS AND AN APPENDIX.

“He that doeth truth cometh to the light, that his deeds may be made manifest, that they are wrought in God.”—JOHN iii, 21.

BELFAST:
GEORGE PHILLIPS, BRIDGE-STREET;
W. CURRY JUN. AND CO. DUBLIN.

1843.

BELFAST
PRINTED IN THE COMMERCIAL CHRONICLE OFFICE.

INTRODUCTION

THE Writer of the following letters neither desired nor contemplated, originally, more than their ephemeral existence. He might, it is true, in presenting them to the public through the medium of the respectable journal whose columns were kindly afforded for that purpose, have anticipated that their effects, through God's blessing, should not be altogether temporary; and in such anticipation, he is thankful to state, he has not been disappointed. As to the productions themselves, however, he was quite content that they should subside into oblivion, when their work had been thus accomplished, among the numerous similar ones which form the literary *residua* of the day. Circumstances to be presently noticed have, notwithstanding, otherwise determined; and in thus affording to his communications a somewhat more permanent and tangible form, the writer may be permitted to allude to his reasons for, in the first instance, appearing in print.

The proceedings connected with the Memorial of the Laity in these Dioceses to the Diocesan, on the subject of the Church Architecture Society, his Lordship's answer, and the results as regards that Society, are now before the public: they are given in the Appendix to the following letters. That much and painful discussion—division among those who ought to be brethren—as well as other even more trying results, have manifested themselves in this matter, cannot be denied; and not a few are to be found who place the entire, or the greater part, of the blame of all this at the door of “CLERICUS CONNORENSIS,” as being the first to stir those troubled waters of polemical disquisition. In extenuation of this, even admitting the charge to be correct, he might plead *good intentions* (a favourite argument with certain other troublers of our Church's peace) but he declines even this plea. While unwilling (though once and again challenged to do so) to resign all claim to the title of either Christian or Christian minister, he can console himself in the recollection, that the religion which he professes, although it be the Gospel of peace, has more than once been the means of introducing warfare, not only into the world but the professing Church. Whether or not the writer of these letters was war-

ranted in coming forward to denounce the opinions and practices which he has endeavoured to expose, must be decided (and he thanks God it will be decided) not by the parties alone who were interested in maintaining the existing state of things, unbroken by any discussion, but by his brethren of the Protestant body at large. A brief reference to passing events will, he trusts, settle this point.

For many months past, it was evident to any person who looked on with an eye of Christian discernment, that the tide of opinions and practices among us was taking a silent, though steady direction, and that an evil one. The pages of a public journal (the *Ulster Times*) teemed with sentiments, original and communicated, of a strangely opposite tendency to what that organ of public opinion once advocated. Gratuitously professing to be the organ of the Established Church in this town and diocese, it advanced statements which many of the ministers of that Church felt to be quite at variance with their own, and, as they believed, those of the Church itself. Claims were set up for Episcopal authority which went to erect each Diocesan into a sovereign autocrat, as far above the laws of the Church as his own individual will or opinion might carry him. The most offensive and exclusive demands were advanced in behalf of the Church of England, as though she were the only true Church on earth, or at least in these kingdoms; and that none could feel themselves assured of salvation beyond her pale. The following extract may serve as a specimen:—

“Our blessed Lord and Master has founded a Church on the earth, destined ultimately to prevail over all error and sin, and ‘to fill the face of the world with fruit;’ the Government of this Church has been appointed by himself, and its ministers go forth armed with his authority, empowered to declare his will—his chosen and anointed Priesthood.

“The Government of the Church, then, is a matter of importance—yea, of primary importance; for those who are destitute of that peculiar form of Church government ordained by the Saviour, and recognised by the Catholic and Apostolic Church of all ages can enjoy no comfortable assurance that they are within the one fold of the one Shepherd.”

It may well be imagined what effect such sentiments and statements would have on the minds of Protestants of other denominations. While the Scripture rule is, that “if it be possible we should live peaceably with all men,” it would seem as though the bounden duty of those who followed in the wake of sentiments such as these, was felt to be the very opposite—namely, to seize every opportunity, and to adopt every means, the most unbefitting, to awaken the dislike and arouse the angry prejudices of persons of other denominations against

the Church of which they themselves were members. Accordingly, the hearts of those who felt a different spirit were unceasingly pained. The chosen topics for pulpit exhortation were such as by-gone religious warfares, better far forgotten, while the antithetical expressions of Popery and Puritanism—Rome and Geneva—the Church of Rome and irregular Protestantism—were unsparingly dealt out to the profitless exasperation of those who, whatever might be the conduct of some equally bigotted on their side, yet, as a body, required very different treatment.

Such were the manifestations of the pulpit and part of the public press; nor was this all. Much about the same time, an attempt was made to introduce a species of periodical literature, in a small way, of a similarly exceptionable character. Tracts, in the shape of dialogues and otherwise, began to make their appearance, which contained the germ of that evil system of doctrine which had been for years threatening to desolate the spirituality, and even to dislocate the external frame-work of our Church. These publications, to those who had discernment enough to perceive it, bore a striking resemblance to the "Tracts for the Times." Their principal features were, a mistiness of statement or total suppression of the all-important subject of a sinner's justification, the exaltation of the outward ordinances of religion, and the priesthood itself, above the hidden grace of the Spirit. Baptism, for instance—that is the outward administration of it—was made the one thing needful, in terms such as closely resembled the Romish "*opus operatum*" doctrine, or that of those who symbolize with Rome in the opinion of exclusively baptismal regeneration. One religious society was set up in preference to another, on the plea of being "*more Church*"—the unmeaning Oxonian cant on this head being thus adopted. Tractarian writers were quoted with approval; and all this in the more dangerous manner, inasmuch as the whole proceeding was on the infinitesimal or homœopathic system in medicine—such small and imperceptible doses of Puseyism being administered as the Protestant taste and spiritual stomach of the Church population in these parts might be expected to bear. Simultaneously, too, with these things, open attacks were made on meetings for religious purposes—the Christian freedom of free-born men and ministers to associate for religious purposes, and take counsel together for the cause of God, was attempted to be questioned, and the more than dubious Ignatian apothegm of "*nothing without the Bishop*" was attempted to be forced into use.

Consequently to these things, or about the same period did the *Ecclesiological or Church Architecture Society* make its appearance

among us. Hatched in secrecy, and making its *debût* in a single day, full-fledged and ready for flight, none could tell, though some might surmise whither, it of necessity attracted many eyes; among others, the writer of the following correspondence felt it his duty to examine into the origin and nature of this (as it is undeniably proved) ill-omened Oxonian bird. Its parent was announced—its parent was examined; and on giving the papers of the Camden Society an attentive perusal (though a cursory one might have well sufficed), the extent of the threatened evil was fully felt. That these anticipations have not been groundless few will now deny. The Camden Society and her daughter have hovered over the peace and prosperity of our Church in these parts, as well as our Diocesan Societies; and *even already* what have been the results?

“*Semesum prædam, et vestigia fœda relinquunt.*”

Whether or not such an interference in these matters was required as “Clericus Connorensis” felt it his duty to adopt, his fellow-Protestants may judge: for their benefit he wrote, and to them he appeals. He has above given a few of those symptoms of a growing tendency to Oxonianism which, for some time back, have been manifesting themselves among us, and others might easily be added. His own mind was firmly convinced that the tares had been sown, and were springing up here, as they have been elsewhere; and even although the sound Scriptural views of some of his brethren, and the deeply-rooted abhorrence of the smallest approach to Popery, which is the characteristic of Protestant Ulster, might seem to some a guarantee against any serious results from such an evil, he felt that, for the sakes of some of his younger brethren in the ministry, the sayings and doings of whom too plainly indicated the bias their minds were in danger of taking, something should be done.

Influenced by these motives, he undertook the task of exposing Puseyism and her twin sister, Ecclesiologism. The event is now before the public. Others came to his aid; and among the rest, the independent proprietors of the *Belfast Commercial Chronicle*. An able pen, too, in the Metropolis—that of the Editor of the *Statesman*—was taken up, and the whole system became apparent. The writer need not anticipate the facts and statements in the accompanying letters; he hopes they may speak for themselves. His share in the exposé thus attempted has been identified by many of his opponents with the *Lay Movement* which afterwards took place. In reply, he has but to state, that, if this accusation be well founded he feels nothing but thankfulness. He looks upon that movement as a clear and blessed indication that his brethren of the Laity in these Dioceses are worthy

the name of Protestants, and as affording a convincing proof that they believe and feel the truths of the glorious Reformation, and of the Bible, worth a contest. If his own humble efforts have either led to, or aided in this most important movement, he desires to give God the praise, and to repeat that he feels humbly thankful.

It is not, nor was it ever the design of the writer to raise a popular clamour against those in authority, or even against the evils in doctrines or practice which he has combated. He would, nevertheless, take this opportunity of warning those on the opposite side, of the tendency which some of their sayings must inevitably have. Such persons are grievously mistaken if they imagine that their poorer brethren are unable to form an opinion on the merits of the question at issue. With their Bibles, the forms of the Church, common sense, and, above all, the Spirit of God for their guide, they are well able to do so; nor can the gratuitous and worse than uncourteous advocacy of any cause, which would thus venture to trample on the feelings of the humbler members of our Protestant Church, have any other effect than to redound with discomfiture on the heads of those who have adopted it. It must, however, be too plain that this is not the likeliest way of producing the much-talked-of peace within our borders.

It may occur to some to make the enquiry—why, when the evil against which those letters were originally directed has been removed, or modified, as they imagine, do they now make their appearance in print a second time? The author of them begs to state, in reply, that his communications are thus reproduced not at the suggestion of his own judgment barely, but at the earnest wish of many, whose opinion and friendship he highly values. As to the evil above alluded to being removed, he believes this is far from the case: as to the modification, if any, which the Church Architecture Society has received, he looks upon it not so much as a concession to public opinion as an unavoidable and constrained retirement from an utterly untenable position, made, too, in such a manner as to require no comment. Ecclesiologism, or even Puseyism is not the *root* of the evil whose growth among us has caused, and is causing just alarm. With all the skilfulness of adaptation for which Romanism itself is so distinguished, the friends and allies of this latter system are endeavouring to entrench themselves in what they are pleased to call a stronghold of *Church*, or *Catholic principles*. These are the modifications of that error which the writer fears, and against which, while life lasts and strength is afforded, he will ever contend. The system advances under a *misnomer*. Church or Catholic principles, as they are called, he believes to be nothing else than Popery in essence; and he grieves

deeply to see brethren in profession walking over the limed twigs thus set for them by the arch-enemy. So long as unscriptural views of Baptismal regeneration, the doing the best we can to seek salvation without even a reference to its only author, the undue exaltation of means and externals—the Church and Sacraments—occupy the place of *Christ, his Spirit, and his Gospel*, all is wrong and nothing right. These errors, it is true, are not Puseyism—they are far older, but not the less dangerous on that account.

The reader of the following pages will perceive *some of the epithets and accusations* which have been the reward of the writer for his pains concerning the matter in hand. It is hoped that the entire correspondence being now given to the public, the accuracy of these charges may appear with as much plainness as their courtesy and dignity. The subject of them can only say that his fervent prayers are already registered in behalf of those who have not only judged, but judged him wrongfully. May the Lord grant them a better spirit! May He “pour into their hearts that most excellent gift of charity, which is the very bond of perfectness!” and may His blessed Spirit so influence all within our beloved Church with the love of *His truth*—the truth as it is in Jesus, as contrasted with all Romish and Oxonian novelties, that she may soon be indeed as “a city at unity with herself!”

ECCLESIOLOGISM EXPOSED.

LETTER I.

ECCLESIOLOGISM.—No. 1.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE BELFAST COMMERCIAL CHRONICLE.

SIR,—In the name of my brethren of the Church of England, in these parts, allow me to congratulate you on the stand you have been enabled to make against the late attempt to introduce amongst us Popish novelties, under the guise of antiquity—Ecclesiology, or, as it is now being denominated, Church Architecture. I think the Protestant part of our community owe you a debt; and, as one of them, I hasten in some measure to pay you, both by thus returning you my sincere thanks, as well as by endeavouring to strengthen your hands. After the *exposé* which your last publication contained, both from your correspondent “CHURCHMAN,” and the *Dublin Statesman*, but little remains to be said as to the tendency of that movement, which you are endeavouring to counteract. I rejoice to learn that your correspondent alluded to is a *layman*. I for one have long thought that the strength of those who would resist the insidious advance of those innovations of our Church’s long-established customs and doctrines, lay, under God, chiefly in the laity; and recent events have not altered my opinion. I will not, I cannot believe, that the independent Protestants of Ulster will permit such tampering with what they should hold far dearer than life, to go on unresisted. Let them bestir themselves—let them strengthen the hands of those who are endeavouring, by God’s blessing, to stand in the gap thus being made in the safeguards of our Scriptural Church, and all will yet be well.

Meanwhile, Mr. Editor, I wish to fortify your readers’ minds by an allusion or two to past and passing events. It is a very favourite assertion with the Oxford gentry, that, so far from being abettors of Papal errors, they are the most redoubted opponents of that system. If any person attempt to pronounce Puseyism and Popery in the same breath, or to place them in the same category, they start with indignation. “Not they! They would not for the world have any thing to do with Rome. How unfair! Are not some of the most decided and powerful antagonists of that corrupt Church to be found among their ranks? Have not Mr. Newman and others written against it?” &c. &c. Now, all this sounds very well; but one *fact* is of more value than a thousand such assertions. Let me just refer to it. Every one has heard of Archbishop Laud; and, although much may be said, and said truly, in extenuation of that weak and misguided man (as appears from his lately republished autobiography), no one, with the light which authentic history sheds on his character, can venture to deny his Popish tendencies. He it was who would have ALTARS—(more of this anon)—in all his churches—of whom even his partial biographer, Heylin, says that he aimed at having

“the doctrines of the Church altered in many things; as, for example, *the Pope not Antichrist*—(so says Dr. Todd also, by the way)—pictures, free-will, &c.; the Thirty-nine Articles seeming patient, if not ambitious, also, of *some Catholic sense*.” This was the man who, when the zealous and pious, though, assuredly, mistaken Dr. Leighton (the Archbishop’s father of the same name) was undergoing the merciless sentence of the pillory, flogging, and cruel mutilation, for having written with undue severity against Prelacy—stood by, nay “pulled off his cap, and gave God thanks for it.” Can we feel surprise at his untimely end, however we may regret his having brought it on himself, by his openly abetting Popery, or however (like his royal master) he may have gone to the scaffold with a martyr’s dignity? Let the truth now be confessed. Laud was a bigot—a promoter of high-church, or, rather, of ultra-church, if not of Papal novelties; and, moreover, a persecutor. He fell on stormy times. The spirit of the Protestantism of that day may have been fierce, but it was sorely goaded, and he paid the penalty of his rashness. But now, Sir, for a comment on all this; taken from the history, too, of the individual in question. *Laud was at one time a stout opposer of Popery*; let his conference with Fisher the Jesuit, testify to this fact; and yet he died under the serious imputation of being a Papist himself.

We find references to this fact, and strong asseverations of his being free from the leaven of the Papacy, in all his posthumous works, yet who believed, who even now believes him? His is a fearful case in point: it shows how easy is the transition from Ultra-Churchism to Popery—from stone altars, and surplices, and lecterns, to crosses, and crucifixes, and bowings, and beckings, and masses, and purgatory, and *Popery*.

Should your indulgence permit, I may again trespass on your space and time with reference to our *Ecclesiological* neighbours and their doings, or rather designs. Meanwhile, I conclude by reminding them of the danger of “*turning aside to crooked ways*,” and praying that God may give them a better mind—less time for propounding ecclesiastical antique novelties, and more heart for preaching the Gospel.—I remain, &c.

LETTER II.

ECCLESIOLOGISM.—No. 2.

SIR,—In my last, I endeavoured to show—and by what is admitted, on the part of all who know the real value of argument, to be the best of all reasoning, namely, *fact*—that those two things are capable of co-existing in the case of an individual, viz., a maintenance of what are styled Church principles (rather Ultra-Churchism) and a tendency to the errors of Rome. Nay, I would venture a further assertion—that by whatever name you designate each of those errors, whether Laudianism, Puseyism, Newmanism, Oxfordism, or High-churchism, on the one hand, and Popery on the other, these are not only closely allied, but so far as the essentials on either hand go, that they are really convertible terms. This is a consideration which I desire to keep before the minds of my brethren of the Church of England in

these perilous times ; and, therefore, at the risk of wearisomeness, I repeat it, and will again and again repeat it,—Ultra-Churchism is but varnished Popery. “Strange,” some will reply—“passing strange! and yet who have been so strenuous in their opposition to Romish errors as those very persons falsely accused of leaning towards it? Have not High-Churchmen written—are they not writing and preaching against it? Have not Episcopal charges appeared full of decided reprobation, not only against it, but of opposition to the tracts themselves?—and yet those very men are accused of Popery! Surely this is lamentable ignorance in their accusers, if not worse.” Now this, Mr. Editor, is nearly the point to which I directed attention in my former communication, and I wish distinctly to deal with it. Without reference to particular persons, I would call attention to the view of the entire case—the case which is now pending before public opinion, and on the issue of which depends, as I am fully persuaded, the existence, in its integrity, of our Protestant Established Religion.

What I believe, then, is this:—The arch-enemy of God’s eternal truth has made, and is continuing a grand move in the deadly game which he has been so long playing against it. His design was deep—it is now apparent. It is not to re-introduce Popery among us, at least this is not his immediate design ; this would be too apparently opposed to all that Protestants hold valuable. By their own admission, however, those persons wish to introduce High-Churchism, and here is real danger. Now, as to what those immediately concerned may themselves think about the matter, this is not the question. It is plain they may be mistaken—they have been so ; and what guarantee is there that they shall not be so again? Some of their partisans are gone to Rome—others are on their road thither ; and although the great remaining mass declare enmity against that fallen church, I conceive the movement is dangerous in the extreme. Here, be it observed, I would make a broad distinction ; that which exists between *deceived* and *deceiving*. As to the pretended enmity of some Oxonians, I look upon it as but an exemplification of the old adage—

“*Amantium iræ*,” &c.

This quarrel will, I much fear, end in a closer intimacy. So long as the organs of Popery laud to the skies the whole system—so long as

“Friend after friend departs”—

so long as the hands of faithful ministers are weakened, and the unity of the Church broken by these “unhappy divisions,” I say the whole affair is mischievous and ruinous.

But to return to *Ecclesiologism*. This, Sir, I look upon as a part of the systematic effort in operation. It would not be difficult to connect, historically, the rise and progress of Puseyism and the new-fangled rage for Church Architecture ; while the close relationship between the two, in sentiment and expression, is equally evident. Let me afford an illustration of this. I have before me a tract issued by the “Camden Society,” of which, by the way, the lately-formed Church Architecture Society in Down and Connor is an affiliated branch. It is styled—“Twenty-three Reasons for getting rid of Church Pews (or pues).” Some of these reasons are good—others

indifferent: there is, indeed, a childishness of reasoning about some parts, which renders the tract any thing but respectable. But the 23d reason, kept to the last, I suppose, because of its formidable force, is the one to which I cannot but direct attention. Here it is:—

“XXIII.—Because they prevent the Congregation from seeing, or being seen from the altar: towards which every worshipper ought to be turned.”

I do not mean to occupy the time of your readers in disputing the point which is here so broadly stated, that a sight of the altar is necessary to the purposes of devotion in the congregation, or by enquiring what is meant by saying that a necessity exists of the congregation “being seen” from that place. Let all this pass—it is puerile. The Apostle says, “I will, therefore, that men may pray *every where*,” and whether in view of this particular part of the sacred edifice or not, all who worship God “in spirit and in truth” will, I believe, be accepted of Him.

I come, however, to what is more tangible; and I desire to know on what authority those Ecclesiologists presume to call “*the communion table*” of the Church of England an Altar? They profess to be antiquarians, and recondite in all the minutiae of rubricality, and are they, can they be ignorant of the fact, that this very word *altar* was designedly expunged from the Book of Common Prayer? Why, then, re-introduce and cling to the use of it? I fear, Sir, in the case of some, at least, of those gentlemen, the answer is too plain. An *altar* infers a *sacrifice*—hence the transition to the monstrous paradox of transubstantiation is prepared, *gradatim*. A sacrifice requires a PRIEST, not simply as an abbreviated form of the term *Presbyter*, but as a *sacrificing* officer in the Church—hence the addenda to this term—the pomp and circumstance attached to the *altar*—the *three steps* of ascent to it—the clearing away of all impediments to its view by the whole congregation—the enormous impropriety, if not heinous sin, of turning the back upon it.

It may not be amiss to direct your readers’ attention here, to a matter which is much in point. In the works of Bishop Ridley, lately republished by the Parker Society, will be found a remarkable document. It is that pious Bishop’s injunction to the clergy of the Diocese of London, on this very subject, in the year 1550. Let us hear him. It commences thus:—

“*First*.—That there be no reading of such injunction as extolleth or setteth forth the Popish Mass, candles, images, chauntries; neither that there be used any superaltaries, or trentals of communions.”

“*Item*.—Whereas in divers places some use the Lord’s board after the form of a table, and some of an altar, whereby dissention is perceived to arise among the unlearned; therefore wishing a Godly unity to be observed in all our diocese, and that the form of a table may move more, and turn the people from the old superstitious opinions of the Popish Mass, and to the right use of the Lord’s Supper, we exhort the curates, church-wardens, and quest-men here present, to erect and set up the Lord’s board after the form of an honest table, decently covered, in such place of the quire or chancel as shall be thought most meet by their discretion and agreement, so that the ministers with the communicants may have their place separated from the rest of the people, and to take down and abolish all other by-altars or tables.”

This, Sir, needs no comment. Bishop Ridley was a true Protestant Bishop. May the Lord pour out more of his spirit upon our rulers and people.—I remain, &c.

LETTER III.

ECCLESIOLOGISM.—No. 3.

SIR,—It was wisely spoken, although by a heathen, "*obsta principiis*." Still more wisely, because divinely, was it written, "a little leaven leaveneth the whole lump." Taking thus common sense and tried experience, and, above all, Scriptural warning for my guide, I continue to call attention to the doings of the party whose title heads this communication.

It is said that ignorance and misapprehension are the causes leading to the opposition which some have ventured to offer to the spread of the Ecclesiological taste in these parts. I am quite willing, for one, to plead guilty, in a good measure, to the former count in this indictment. I am ignorant of many of the mysteries of this revived science. I know little, and—at the risk of being numbered among the clerical Goths of our day—I add, that I care little about fald-stools, and lecterns, and credences, and *id genus omne* of church furniture. By the way, I would venture to give a hint: might not this new society better be styled the *Church-furnishing* Society; or, as Greek names are in vogue, the *Ecclesiosceueological*, and its admirers *Ecclesiosceueologists*? I thought, in my simplicity, that we really had been building some dozen or two of new churches in these dioceses within the last few years, and that they were to be left as their talented and tasteful architect had originally designed them, and according to the old saying of "well enough alone." But it appears new light is rising upon us—the Oxford and Cambridge, the Camden and Newman luminaries are shining upon our architectural darkness. Well, Sir, be it granted that we are ignorant in such matters; further, as we are to confess, that we are *ignorant of the motives* of the gentlemen who are originating this movement. I care not what their motives are; they may be excellent—they may be themselves the most honest and well-intentioned people in the world, as well as deeply versed in Ecclesiological lore, so deeply, indeed, that even the architect just referred to, and others, ought to go to school to them. But what of all this?—are *good intentions* sufficient guarantees, when we see the Church's peace broken—her rubrics slighted (as I have shown they are, in my last letter, in the attempted re-introduction of ALTAR, both name and thing.) When Mr. Sibthorpe began, much in the same way, by painting and decorating his church in the Isle of Wight—by setting up altars and gilded rails, and wax-candles and crosses, who dare dispute his *good intentions*, and where have they left him?—Again, our objections are all founded in misapprehension. Be it so. I want to apprehend nothing but what is borne out by facts. I deal with these at present. Let me remind your readers of one or two, and state some plain deductions.

First, then, the Down, Connor, and Dromore Church Architecture Society is in connexion with the Camden Society:—next, the Cam-

den Society, on account of its manifest tendencies, has been abandoned by some of the wisest and best of the Prelates on the English bench. These are facts, Mr. Editor, and let your readers make their own inferences. Once more: the writings and publications of this (the Camden) Society are before the world; *they have been received, and with a vote of thanks, by the Down, Connor, and Dromore Society.* I take it then they are *approved*. Now let me return to that one which I brought under review in my last, and we shall see something more of this valuable institution, and the animus of its agitators.

Here then, are “Twenty-three Reasons for getting rid of Church Pews (or pues.)” I have already called attention to one of these reasons—the last, though not the least. Let us now take another specimen. It runs thus:—

“XX.—Because sometimes they are *let for money* which is no better than a kind of *simony*.”

Now, Sir, a principle, if it be a right one, will bear pushing out. Let us try this one by such a test. To let a pew in a church (it is not stated parish church or otherwise), is a kind of simony; therefore, we must abolish pews and pew-letting at once. But what is the fact? If this were done, a vast number of churches in the United Kingdom would be altogether closed, or, at least, would be deprived of any support for their ministers. Every one knows or may know, that in the great proportion of chapels of ease, proprietary chapels, those under trustees, &c., the principal support of the minister is derived from pew-rents. But, say the Ecclesiologists, this is “a kind of simony;” therefore, away with them and their ministers also. I would not be mistaken, Sir: I am no ultra-advocate for the pew-letting system—I would greatly prefer the old parochial plan being extended, to meet the spiritual wants of our people. But it is not so. The providence of God has opened another door, mainly through the benevolence of the laity, to supply the inadequacy of ministration in our parish churches, and the letting of the pews is the principal support of the ministers in these cases: are we, therefore, in obedience to this newly-issued Ecclesiological dictum, to throw away the blessing God has conferred on us? I trust not.

Here, it will be said, no such thing is *meant*. Perhaps not. But if words and legitimate calculation of the consequences to be derived from following them mean any thing, the above reason tends to this. No, Sir; this will not do. Men think proper to turn advisers, and give reasons: before we take their advice, or admit their reasons, we must try them. And now *exempli gratiâ*—and we need not go far for one—I take that of the town and parish of Belfast.

There are, in this locality, between Churches and Chapels of Ease, seven places of worship, besides one in process of erection. Out of these there is an endowment, by rent-charge, but for two—St. Anne’s and St. George’s. The rest are provided for by small grants from the “Additional Curates’ Society” (in one or two cases), *and the remainder of the ministers’ incomes*, in every instance, except those endowed as above, is drawn from pew-rents, that is, say the Ecclesiologists, from simony! Put their plans into practical effect, and let us see the result. Let us begin, for instance with Christ Church. Here there is no endowment whatever; and as the same society has a mortal hatred to galleries, because the altar cannot be seen thence, these of course must

come down, and with them the entire support of the Minister. Thus one preacher of the Gospel is Ecclesiologically provided for. Let us go to the Parish Church of the town, and what shall we say here? This is beyond all endurance: here the first curate's salary, as well as other necessary demands, is, I believe, in a great measure, paid from the same fund—there are pews, and the pews are let. "Simony!" cries the Ecclesiologist, and so another minister is dispensed with. So for the rest—so for the beautiful new church (Trinity) which is raising its taper spire, as the principal architectural ornament of our town—alas, alas! it too has pews, and these pews are to be let for the Minister's use. This is Simony too, and so it need not be proceeded with either, The pews!—the pews!—Simony! See what new light the Camden Society has thrown on these matters!

And now, Mr. Editor, in sober earnest, are these Ecclesiological plans, after all, so fraught with good? Is "the dim religious light" of their stained-glass windows preferable to the light of the Gospel, held forth from the pulpits of so many of our churches, although the Minister *may* turn his back on the altar (!) while thus preaching Christ to the people? Will these views bear pushing out. That is the question. Let us go farther than our own town. What, sir, will the anti-pew and simony cry do for *Dublin*, for *Liverpool*—yes, for our countryman (I had almost said townsman), the Rev. H. M'Neile, and Messrs. Ould, Baylie, and a whole host of true-hearted Irish evangelical Protestant ministers, whom we have lent to England to stem the torrent of Popery and sin, which has been long threatening our fellow-subjects there? Why they may all either leave their churches, or live on their own means—and why? Pews and pew-rents are simoniacal. So says the Camden Society!

One word more, Sir, before (for the present) taking leave of pews, and their *pueissant* antagonists. It is worth the while of yourself, and our Protestant neighbours, just to think for a moment *what sort of men would be most affected by the war upon pews—verbum sat*. Of course the authors of this system did not think of this; but no matter—others are doing so—other eyes are upon their doings: and *His eye* who is the discernor of the thoughts and intents of all hearts.—I remain, &c.

LETTER IV.

ECCLESIOLOGISM.—No. 4.

SIR,—Since I first felt it my duty to call public attention, through the medium of your journal, to the subject whose consideration I now resume, additional light has been thrown upon it. This is all that I desired. Every thing which is truthful and Protestant seeks the light—the converse is true of what is sinister and Popish. I still desire nothing else than that the light of Scripture and common sense should be let in on the Ecclesiological movement attempted here. I say advisedly attempted, persuaded as I am there is enough of true Evangelical, Protestant, and Bible-loving principle among our nobility, clergy, and laity, to induce them to withdraw their hands

from any effort which has a manifest tendency towards Romish error, or what is as bad, if not worse. I desire to feel and write under the influence of that charity which God's Word commends and commands, and feeling this, I cannot believe that some of those who have sought to transplant a scion of the *Camden Society* among us, were sufficiently aware of what they have been doing.

My attention has been called to a document, extending over nearly three columns of one of your contemporary journals, the *Ulster Times*; and were there nothing else to give its death-blow to the infant Ecclesiologistic institution, in the estimation of all who love and reverence sound Church of England principles, that production would, I feel satisfied, have this effect. I mean not to follow its verbose writer through all his wanderings into the regions of architectural romance; but in order to give your readers a specimen of the kind of men and teachers who profess adherence to Ecclesiologism, I shall just glance at his *apology*.

This gentleman, who adopts the signature of "M." proclaims himself a divine of "*means reduced below the condition of decent subsistence*" by the recent legal spoliation of church income. He is, moreover, one who is willing to do battle with any unhappy wight who would be guilty of "*insulting a Bishop*;" and has a keen scent to discover, in all attempts to resist Ecclesiologism, "*a spirit of extreme puritanical malignity*." Your readers may form a tolerable estimate of such a gentleman's *status quo* in thus coming forth to the controversy. I pass over, also, his defence of Puseyism, and his uneasiness at such a *nickname* being put upon a system taken from a person who, he has no doubt, "*desires to be a faithful member of the Church, whatever his errors may have been*;" and all this, be it observed, thus confidently stated, in a matter which he has "*casually learned*;" for, adds this clergyman, "*of the Tracts themselves I have never read one!*" And yet he is quite sure their tone and tendency put them beyond the reach of reprehension! This *might*, I conceive, suffice for the Ecclesiologist in question; perhaps, however, some may differ from him. I, for one, *have read them*—I have considered them carefully, from No. 1 to No. 90, and unhesitatingly declare my opinion (which if God spare me I shall further show to be far from groundless), that more false and libellous glosses on Gospel truth, and more derogatory to the doctrine of England's national faith, never came from the pen of open or concealed enemy.

Let me now trespass further on your readers' attention, by just two quotations from this apologist's essay. The former shall be on what all admit a serious subject—Justification by Faith. Here are his views:—

"*Justification by faith stands, as it were, at the threshold of the Christian religion: it is made ours by Baptism—for we 'believe one Baptism for the remission of sins'; and is again made ours, on every subsequent repentance of any lapse from the obligations of the baptismal covenant. That pardon or remission returns or departs with our repentance, like the ebbing or flowing of the sea; but the final justification or pardon stands no where but at the gate of heaven.*"

What, Mr. Editor, will your readers think of this? Is this the kind of teaching we are to expect from the friends and founders of the Ecclesiological Society? If it be, then I say they may spare them-

selves any further trouble—we can have *such teaching* without any improvement or re-modelling of our old-fashioned Protestant Churches—we can have Justification thus taught in the Vatican—at St. Peter's (*architectural* enough surely)—at the Church of the Conception—in our own metropolis, in the Cathedral of St. Malachi, now raising its towered height (most ecclesiologically !) in Belfast ; we may have ourselves and children thus taught by any mass-priest to whom we may please to commend them, for this is the very doctrine of Rome. Yes, Sir, here is Church of England teaching, on the improved, the Ecclesiological plan. Here is not “Justification by Faith only”—oh, no !—that is old-fashioned—that would savour of the “*French Lawyer*” (Calvin), and the “*uncatholic*” Luther, and the “irreverent dissenter” (Jewell). I write, because I feel, warmly. Is it indeed come to this, that a minister of the Church of England should venture, in this day of widely-spread Gospel light and truth, and in Protestant Ulster, to propound the Romish dogma of *inherent and progressive justification*, and style it truth ? Let me, however, cite a witness against this Ecclesiologist, and it is one whose authority few will gainsay. Thus writes Richard Hooker, on this very subject :—

“This grace they will have to be applied by infusion—to the end, that as the body is warm by the heat which is in the body, so the soul might be righteous by inherent grace, which grace they make capable of increase ; as the body may be more and more warm, so the soul more and more justified, according as grace should be augmented, the augmentation whereof is merited by good works, as good works are made meritorious by it. Wherefore, the first receipt of grace, *in their divinity*, is the first justification ; the increase thereof, the second justification. As grace may be increased by the merit of good work, so it may be diminished by the demerit of sin's revival—it may be lost by mortal sin. Inasmuch, therefore, as it is needful in the one case to repair, in the other to recover, the loss which is made, the infusion of grace hath her sundry after-meals, for the which cause they make many ways to apply the infusion of grace. *It is applied to infants in baptism, without either faith or works*, and in them really it taketh away original sin, and the punishment due unto it. It is applied to infidels and wicked men in the first justification, through baptism without works, yet not without faith, and it taketh away both sins actual and original, together with all whatsoever punishment, eternal or temporal, thereby deserved. Unto such as have attained the first justification—that is to say, the first estate of grace, it is applied further by good works to the increase of former grace, which is the second justification. *If they work more and more, grace doth more increase, and they are more and more and more justified*. To such as diminish it by venial sin it is applied by holy water, Ave Marias, crossings, papal salutations, and such like, which serve for reparations of grace decayed. To such as have lost it through mortal sin, it is applied by the sacrament (as they term it) of penance ; which sacrament hath power to confer grace anew, yet in such sort, that being so conferred, it hath not altogether so much power as at the first. For it only cleanseth out the stain or guilt committed, and changeth the punishment eternal into a temporal satisfactory punishment here, if time do serve ; if not, hereafter to be endured, except it be lightened by masses, works of charity, pilgrimages, fasts,

and such like ; or else shortened by pardon for term or by plenary pardon quite removed and taken away."

Let us now hear the good Reformer's judgment on such a doctrine as above given. He thus continues :—

"*This is the mystery of the man of sin. This maze the Church of Rome doth cause her followers to tread when they ask her the way to justification. I cannot stand now to unrip this building, and sift it piece by piece ; only I will pass it by in few words—that that may befall Babylon, in the presence of that which God hath builded, as happened unto Dagon before the Ark!* * * * *Christ hath merited righteousness for as many as are found in Him. In Him God findeth us, if we be faithful; FOR BY FAITH WE ARE INCORPORATED INTO CHRIST.*"—(Hooker's "Discourse on Justification.")

Need I go further? Need I appeal to the still higher authority of the Church herself against this her calumniator? Need I ask your readers to set his views of justification before her XIth Article, and convict him? I will not try their patience or yours further: this only I would say, with my heart's whole sincerity—from such teachers of fundamental truth may our people long be preserved!

Once more, Sir—hear this gentleman's views as to Rome, and our separation from her :—

"*And if the Oxford divines have sighed to think that we are separate from Rome—that there is disunion between provinces of the Christian Church, whether of greater or less extent,—that to those provinces of it which, without any just cause, have relinquished their own independence and received the superstitious practices and heretical doctrines of Rome, we cannot be joined in Christian fellowship ; and that the world must still be deprived of that full testimony to the faith of Christ which would result from a general unity, even according to the words of his most sacred prayer,—“Neither pray I for these alone, but for them also which shall believe on me through thy word : that they all may be one, as thou, Father, art in me, and I in thee, that they also may be one in us, that the world may believe that thou hast sent me”—their sorrow does not seem causeless or uncharitable.*"

This *may* be charity ; but sure I am it is not the charity which burned in the bosoms of our holy Reformers. It may be wisdom thus to seek Rome's alliance, but it is *not that wisdom* which the Word of God describes as being "*first pure, then peaceable.*" Is it indeed come to this, that Rome—the place of Apostacy, the foredoomed Babylon, from whose plagues and destruction our Sainted Sires fled at God's awful command, that they might not be partakers of them—that land of the shadow of death, for our being beyond whose precincts we were wont to give God thanks—that this place is now, by the light of Ecclesiologism, discovered to be indeed not such as we were wont to think of it, but one of "*the provinces of the Christian Church !*" Again, I say, may Ireland's National Church speedily be purged of such teaching as this!

I had hoped to have been done with this extremely painful subject ere this. I have not, however, and, God willing, with your permission, Mr. Editor, the public shall hear from me concerning it again.—I remain, &c.

LETTER V.

ECCLESIOLOGISM.—No 5.

SIR,—In my last I gave a specimen of the *doctrinal* views of some adherents of the attempted High-Church movement among us; they need little further comment; it would be a task of but little difficulty to show that both the opinions and sentiments alluded to are nearly identical with those of the Church of Rome; and this, be it observed, on a confessedly fundamental subject—*Justification*.

Feeling that the task which I undertook, under the influence of a sense of duty to my brethren of the Church of England in these quarters, is now nearly complete, I desire to leave off this branch of the subject. In doing so, I would briefly advert to one or two imputations which have been cast on those who take my view of the matter in hand, and similar ones. We are accused of discountenancing a legitimate taste for Church Architecture—of preferring barn-like and unsightly edifices to those erected on truly tasteful and ecclesiastical principles for the worship of God. In reply to such assertions—for they are nothing more—I can only say that they are unfounded. I for one, Sir, love the chaste and beauteous structures of my National Church. I would not remove one stone from those venerable cathedral piles which crown and dignify our cities. I venerate and approve the wisdom of our ancestors who planned and executed these monuments of architectural skill in past ages. So far from deyring them, I would restore and preserve them: nay more, I would take such treatment of our old cathedral and parochial edifices, as a type and model of that which our Church itself should receive at the hands of her true children. I am not so devoted an admirer of antiquity as to leave either our Church or her edifices as specimens *venerandæ rubiginis*, to go to ruins; but I would have both, like the cathedral of our Irish Metropolitan See, under the princely and judicious hand and eye of our revered Primate, rising from dust and ashes to new and beautiful restoration.

That, Sir, is the kind of Church Architecture which I like; not the groping amid old ruins for the deformed remains of a rude age, and talking about Ecclesiologism, while, perhaps, some of our parish churches, though not unfrequently dignified by the presence of some of our prelates, are the laughing-stock of the multitude for their neglected and contemptible appearance.

Some, too, talk with alliterative propriety of the Scylla and Charybdis of Popery and Puritanism, and the danger of running from one extreme to another. Now, Sir, such persons may add, if they please, another ecclesiastical grace to these, and thus make the triad complete by annexing Puseyism to the remaining two. But what have I, or any who think with me, to do with them? Nothing. The classical locality of the rock and whirlpool is that of the *Italian shore*: those who coast thereabouts may fear them. I prefer the open sea—the English channel if you please, at present, and, by God's blessing, I am safe there.

Quid Romæ faciam? Better let our advisers look at home. It would not be very difficult to find extremes among some Ecclesiologists—to point to examples of persons of that school, whose history furnishes proof that men may be one day in the very mire of dissent, and, perhaps, the next singing the “Io triumphe!” of High-Churchism from the *vane* of the steeple. I prefer the safe *via media* of true Churchmanship, marked by the lines and charity of Gospel truth, which I pray that God may enable me to choose in these deceiving days.

And now, Sir, to bring these communications to a close, I desire to give a few reasons why I consider the Society in question undeserving of the support and confidence of the true members of the Church of England:—

1. *Suspicion attaches to it.* I repudiate as much as any, the whispers of a false and groundless suspicion; but there may be just and well-grounded causes for entertaining this feeling as well as the reverse. What, I would ask, is the history of this Society’s origin? Hardly any person heard of it until it was publicly announced as in existence and operation, with a list of officers, members, &c.; and when those of the clergy and laity, whose co-operation is sought, come to enquire into particulars—what are they? Is it a fact or not, that its professedly general inaugural meeting was held in a private manner, and without any public notice; and from this assemblage comes forth the announcement, as new as surprising, that an Ecclesiological Society is in operation among us. Now why this mystery? Why such a marked contrast between these proceedings and those which ushered into existence the Down and Connor Church Accommodation Society? Let us just ask, would the *truly Church Architecture Society* just referred to have been made the honoured instrument of dispensing its tens of thousands, in a few years, in the erection of nearly a score of churches in these dioceses, had its origin been of a similar kind? I say, unhesitatingly, No: we are still in these parts, and in this town, sufficiently PROTESTANT to prefer open councils, and the free expression of opinion, on Church as well as other matters, to closed doors and mysterious proceedings.

But this is a mere nothing in the matter. Gentlemen are quite at liberty to take such a course as the founders of this Society have taken as to its institution, or rather introduction, among us. Perhaps I may seem impertinent in questioning their better judgment; but this I will fearlessly assert—suspicion most justly attaches to the parent, *i. e.* the *Camden Society*. Deny this who will, the assertions I have already made have met, and can meet no denial. Let any person examine the publications and proceedings of that Society, (I have given a specimen of them), and take into his account that some of the most respected Prelates of the English bench have withdrawn their names and support from it, and then say whether or not this branch of the Camden Society deserves any thing better at our hands than watchfulness, eye and suspicion—just suspicion too.

2. I look upon such a society as *useless*. The multiplication of societies is a prevailing epidemic in our day. Many of them are, in my apprehension, needless, if not worse; and in this category I am strongly disposed to place the Ecclesiological Society. Let me give you one or two reasons for saying so.

As to the building, repairing, and furnishing of churches, "*with all things necessary to the celebration of divine service, preaching, and administration of the sacraments,*" I think competent provision is made by the Canons of our Church. (See the *English Canons*, under the head of "Things appertaining to Churches," from canon 80 to 88 inclusive, and the *Irish Canons*, 94 to 97. For the carrying-out of these, we have, at present, the legally-appointed Ecclesiastical Commission; for their aid, also, the Church-building Societies already established here and elsewhere; and, above all, the *Diocesan's legitimate* power. It will be seen by a glance at the above canons, that in every one of the particulars alluded to, "if any question be made of it," "*the Ordinary of the place*" has ample jurisdiction to determine such question. What need, then, of an Ecclesiological Society? If, as has been said, our churches have been permitted to lapse into a state of neglect and disgraceful uncleanness—if the *font* has been displaced and disused (in defiance of the canons above cited), and the *pulpit* unecclesiastically protruded from its proper situation—and I deny not that such has been, and still is, the case in too many instances—what, then, has been the cause of all this irregularity?—what its legitimate remedy? I say, unhesitatingly, a proper and vigorous exercise of episcopal control. What would civilians think, Sir, of a society for enabling the magistrates and other executive officers in our land to put into execution their respective functions? Would this be complimentary to these functionaries? Let our Diocesans exercise their rule vigorously, as real "fathers in God" of their clergy and people, and they will be obeyed, without Ecclesiology to help them.

3. I think the Ecclesiologists are *beginning at the wrong end*. This, Sir, may sound trivially, but it is a weighty consideration. Oh! that we might all be led to consider very carefully the characters of those to whom the Divine Redeemer said—"These ought ye to have done, and not to leave the others undone." I consider that with all its mistakes, and I am unwilling to charge its originators with more than this, the movement towards Ecclesiology will do good. It proclaims that a reform in our Church is needed: in this many will agree; but shall we begin with the form and fashion, the painting and decoration of the material structure? God forbid. Rather let us begin at the right end—let us look nearer to self—let us, in God's sight, ask ourselves the solemn question—are we all, clergy and laity, what we ought to be? Dare we repeat that cry attempted to be raised—"The Church as she is!" Should we not rather say instead—"The Church as she ought, and as God would have her, to be?" Stained glass windows, and carved oak ceilings, &c. &c. are all very good in their way. I for one would be very far from objecting to them, *provided there were no assimilation to the idolatry of Rome in them*. But is the introduction of these reform?—Is their being placed in our churches the revival of true religion?—Does it tend naturally to this? I trow not. If it did, we might go at once for a model to Milan and Cologne. No, Sir—a painted, and gilded, and ceiled, yea, an ecclesiastically correct church, *without a Gospel ministry within its walls*, is just a carcase—a dead, though it may be a fair body—without a living soul. Nor will our people relish all this. The children of our beloved National Church will not be put off with a stone instead of bread. It appears that the churches of Belfast (as a late

correspondent in the *Ulster Times*—"a Clergyman of Down"—has thought fit to state) are no better than "*barns*." I would appeal, in passing, to your readers, Sir, whether this is a becoming or reverent use of language, from the pen of a minister of the Church of England, concerning the house of God; for "*barns*" though they be, this Ecclesiologist should recollect that they are, all of them, consecrated or licensed churches of the diocese. So much for the respect shown to the houses of God by persons of this school. Let, however, the outward structure be what it may, if Christ be there in his ordinances and preached Gospel, His believing people will prefer even a *barn* to the stateliest edifice Ecclesiology can produce. The upper chamber in Jerusalem, when He was there, was preferable to the Temple itself without Him.

In conclusion, then, I repeat it, if reformation in our Church be undertaken, let us begin at the right end of the work. I deny not that even an improvement in Church Architecture would be desirable, if undertaken in the right way; but so long as other, and infinitely more important branches of reform are loudly called for, we can well wait as regards this. Just let me allude to one item—PATRONAGE. Is there nothing to be learned or done here? I could say much, and if occasion demands it, I am prepared, by God's help, to sound this word aloud, with its attendant evils and abuses, until our laity, who ought to do so, shall look for a legitimate remedy. For the present, however, I forbear. My sincere desire is, that God may stir up the hearts of his believing people in our communion to pray and strive, not for improvements in Church Architecture, but that "the healthful Spirit of his Grace" may be poured upon "our bishops, and curates, and all congregations committed to their charge," that ministers and people may be led to seek rather the things which tend to edifying, than be occupied in Ecclesiological trifles—that, surrounded as we are, by enemies, rather the spirit of amity and Godly love should be among us, than the sound of strife. If, however, (as, alas! who can deny it?) contention and discord be within the pale of our Church, who are the promoters, as well as the primary cause? I answer Tractarian Ecclesiologists!—I remain, &c.

LETTER VI.

ECCLESIOLOGISM AND THE ULSTER TIMES ONCE MORE.

SIR—I perceive, notwithstanding his solemn valediction on this subject, given a few days since, your contemporary and his correspondents appear to be rather disposed to follow it up with greater zeal than ever. In the announcement alluded to, he was kind enough to invite me, likewise, to conclude the subject through the medium of his columns. For reasons which I need not detail, however, I prefer to trespass on yours, and even to endanger my character for adherence to promises of leave-taking, by requesting your insertion of the following remarks.

A correspondent of the Journal above referred to, has favoured the public with some selections from the "Ecclesiologist," the organ of

the Camden Society. What were his motives he, of course, can alone say; but it certainly does appear to me a strange way of confirming the testimony of certain advocates on his own side of the question (who have lately laboured to *disconnect* the Down and Connor from its parent, the Camden Society), by adducing this same Ecclesiologist *in proof of their being intimately and affectionately* allied, as Delta has done. Let this pass; I think it will now require some Ecclesiological logic of a new order to disprove what I formerly asserted, and now again assert, that Ecclesiology in Ulster (as recently attempted) is, and was designed to be, but a kindred movement with the same work which has been going on in Oxford and Cambridge.

As your contemporary and his friends, however, have looked over, and seem disposed to make *excerpta* from this valuable publication, the Ecclesiologist, which so warmly eulogises our Down, Connor, and Dromore Society, permit me to present your readers with a specimen or two from the same.

Among notices of new churches I find the following of *St. Mary's, Arley Park, Cheshire*. After bestowing no small praise on this structure, for correctness of Architecture, &c. we have the following in the close:—

“After all, the most cheering part of all is *the spirit in which the chapel was founded and is erecting*, and we cannot refrain from gratifying our readers with the *beautiful inscription* which was engraved on the foundation stone:—

“+ In nomine Dei + Amen. Qui super fundamentum Apostolorum et Prophetarum, ipso summo angulari lapide Christo + Jesu, ædificavit ecclesiam—*et in honorem Beatæ Mariæ Virginis*, primum lapidem hujus oratorii posuit Rolandus Warburton, armiger, quo verbum Dei quotidie fovet (qu. sonet ?) precesque fidelium ascendant. Anno Salutis, MDCCCXLII.”

For the benefit of your English readers, I venture on a translation of this inscription, premising that I must be presumptuous enough to propose an emendation in the last line but one, or else leave it untranslated; for, in truth, unless *sonet* or some other word be used as a *lectio varians* for *fovet*, I must confess myself unable to account for the latinity of this learned piece of *modern antiquity*.

“+ In the name of God + Amen. Who has built his Church upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus + Christ being the chief corner stone, AND IN HONOUR OF THE BLESSED VIRGIN MARY, the first stone of this oratory was laid by Roland Warburton, Esq. wherein the Word of God might be heard (?) daily, and the prayers of the faithful ascend. In the year of redemption, 1842.”

I shall just ask your readers how they like this specimen of Ecclesiological religion. I do not wish to use a needlessly harsh word, yet can I not forbear to protest, thus solemnly, against such a commingling of the names of God and a creature, however excellent, as blasphemous.

Take another example. Toward the close of the first volume of this precious periodical we have a nice letter on *Confessionals*, in which the following FEELING paragraph occurs:—

“This (the subject of Confessionals) is, I admit, *in the present discipline of our Church*, a matter of antiquarian interest *rather than one of the many neglected usages* which you are *more immediately concerned in endeavouring to restore*,” &c. &c.

Now, Sir, this is, I contend, quite enough as a sample of Ecclesiology (and I could give much more) for some of your readers, as it is for myself. We can understand quite well the *use of the wedge*—we can trace the *quo tendis* of the feather on the gale. Do our Ecclesiologists really think that the Protestants of Ulster—the true-hearted nobility, clergy, and gentry of England's National and Scriptural Church, will be gulled in this way? I tell them, nay; and I add, let them take care of what they are doing. Our fathers in the Protestant faith contended for it, and, by God's grace, they will find before long, if their children be thus trifled with, that they have not quite forgotten the lesson which has been thus bequeathed to them. I remain, &c.

LETTER VII.

WHAT IS PUSEYISM?—No. 1.

SIR—In my last I took leave of Ecclesiologism—do not, therefore, accuse me of a breach of faith, while, in bringing under your notice, and that of your readers, another subject, I cast a parting glance backward to the one which we have left. I think it must have attracted your notice, that my poor efforts in the cause of what I conceive to be truth, have had at least one token that they were not in vain—I allude to the numerous respondents to your anonymous contributor who have made their appearance. And what has been the result? Time will tell. I do not mean to reply to those gentlemen, known or unknown. I merely wish to draw attention to the fact, that many such have undertaken to reply, as well as the character of their replies. An analysis of these would be an easy, though a disagreeable, task. *Abuse* forms a large proportion of them. Your readers may have seen, for instance, the production of one—a clergyman too—who is particularly anxious to be distinguished by name, designation, &c. as the Goliath of the Ecclesiological army. If so, they will, I am sure, dispense with any reply from me. He has excluded his brother of Connor from any claim to the title of Christian, gentleman, or scholar, and so overwhelmed him with compliments of the same description, that he is more than excused from attempting any return. I shall not name him: *I have done so, and shall continue to do so, in another manner.* I pray for him, and if, through Sovereign grace, he and I be permitted to meet in another place, where vituperation cannot enter, and but one language fills every mouth,—he may then believe the possibility of persons differing on such a subject as that in dispute, and yet not being either of them excluded from the number of God's servants.

I am really at a loss how to characterise the *counter statements* and *attempted deductions* which comprise a great deal of what abuse has left undone in the way of reply. For example: one gentleman argues that the *Camden Society* can have no connexion with Puseyism, *because* he was in their rooms, and *saw nothing of Puseyism there, but models of architecture, &c. &c. &c.*—or in words to that effect. Another, or I believe the same, argues the same point, viz. that the Camden Society cannot be an abettor of Puseyism, *because Dr. Pusey is a member, and has joined it within the last few months!* Meanwhile, the *facts*, and their legitimate inferences which I felt it my duty to

bring before the Protestant part of our community, remain just where I left and now leave them. They are (or some of them) briefly these : The Ecclesiological Society, which was lately, and silently, introduced among us, is a *Branch of the English Camden Society*. Item : That Society is closely allied to the Oxford movement in that country.—Item : Some of the best and wisest of the English Bishops have withdrawn from the above Parent Society. Item : All truly Evangelical members of the Church of England to whom I have spoken, or of whom I have made enquiry (and these are not a few, in England, as well as in this country), suspect and dislike the tone and tendency of this rage for Church Architecture.

But now, Mr. Editor, let us go on one step farther : I like coming to the root of this or any other matter, and we shall have done so (or nearly so, for, in truth, the root here lies dark and deep), by endeavouring to furnish a plain, Protestant, and satisfactory reply to the question which heads this communication—*What is Puseyism ?*

Before doing so, permit me to suggest, briefly, the spirit in which it should be asked. The question is in many mouths, but I fear not accompanied, in many cases, by a proper spirit. We have our *alarmists*. They have heard of Puseyism, and forthwith, because some one or other has said it is a bad thing, and nearly allied to popery, they go forth, not even with the question, what is it ? but with the outcry—"Put it down ! Drive it away !" &c. I need hardly say this is an unworthy spirit. Again, we have our *official friends*—persons who speak thus : "Puseyism ! horrible !—yes, and the Church of England is deeply infected with it—her hierarchy, clergy, and laity are all going mad after this Romish abomination. Puseyism ! put it down by all means. !"—and then quietly add this consideration, inasmuch as the Established Church is thus awfully corrupt, the best plan to uproot and destroy Puseyism, is to adopt the Scottish Reformer's plan as regards the monasteries and cathedrals of his native land—"pull down the rookery and get rid of the rooks,"—demolish the Establishment, and you will effectually check Puseyism. I would merely say to all such opponents of Puseyism (and I am not ignorant that there are some not very distant), "*Haud defensoribus istis.*" We shall never refuse the office of real friendship ; but such a clamorous cry against Puseyism as this, from such evidently interested motives, and with such ends, we cannot approve.

But again, we have our friends in the very opposite extreme ; they say of Puseyism, that it is a mere phantom—its abettors a mere fraction in the great mass of our Church population. "Let it alone," is their cry, "it will die a natural death, opposition will only serve it."

Now, Sir, whatever I might have thought of such a line of procedure some five or six years back, I am prepared entirely to dissent from it at this stage of the business. I would neither with the alarmist exaggerate the evil ; nor with the ignorant join in a vain cry of "the Church in danger ;" but neither would I, with the party last alluded to, fold my hands and cry "peace, peace," while danger imminent and apparent danger—is at the door. I believe this to be the case—I believe that hundreds of both clergy and laity in England are infected with this dangerous error. I believe, further, that it has many secret abettors, and half-decided opponents who only wait for a moment of greater safety openly to avow its principles. I believe that, owing to it,

not alone the Established form of religion—this would be, indeed, much, yet it would be as the small dust in the balance compared to what I now state—I am fully satisfied that GOD'S TRUTH is in imminent danger from Puseyism; not, indeed, of being lost—that cannot be—but of being damaged and driven from us, and supplanted by a gross corruption of it.

Well, then, does any calm, reasonable Protestant, and spiritually enlightened member of our national faith, or of any other orthodox branch of Christ's church ask—"What is Puseyism?" to such I shall endeavour, God being my helper, to give an answer.—I remain, &c.

LETTER VIII.

WHAT IS PUSEYISM?—No. 2.

SIR,—In proceeding with a reply to this question, it may be well to give a brief historical outline of the party identified with it. I have used the name Puseyism, because it is the most familiar one applied to that party, and is liable to little risk of mistake. While, however, upon the naming of these gentlemen, and the movement which they lead or follow, it is worthy of remark how jealous they are of being called by any distinctive title. They complain of being nick-named if called *Puseyites*; if termed *Oxonians*, or *Oxford-men*, they bring the whole of that venerable University to the rescue, and indignantly demand why should it be involved in the bad odour attached to a suspected party. And, in truth, there is much justice in this plea; I should be sorry to think Oxford-men generally were Puseyites—there are, I trust, many goodly exceptions. Again, they dislike *Newmanism*; it is certainly an unfortunate *ism*, and is connected with a pun which some opponent or other has raised at their expense, who styled the movement a *New-mania*. Others of their party dislike to be called *Tractarian*, and little wonder, since Tract 90, with its covert Jesuitism and unblushing Popery, appeared as the colophon of their compilation. After all, then, I am as little liable to be misunderstood by those for whom I write, and to give offence to those whose opinions I oppose, if I leave them their best known designation of *Puseyites*. I cannot, however, avoid again remarking this same *disinclination to be named*. Truth loves the light—error hates it. At first the party made many and serious protestations against deserving the name of a party at all; now it appears that there is such a body, to use their own playful designation of "*Conspirators*." Why then not submit to a name? Do they imagine that they are unknown? Do they fear to come to the light? This is impossible—they must come forth, one and all, from the leaders in this movement to the lowest and most distant participator in it, and be tried by Scripture light, and at the bar of Protestant opinion. The time for concealment is gone by; the LAITY are awake, and may they be still more aroused and awakened! Let them look well to their rights as Christian free-men, and remember their Master's emphatic declaration, which full well applies here—"He that is not with me is against me."

To return, however, to the historical glance at the rise of Puseyism. We have an outline of it given by an unexceptionable witness—one of their own party—namely, the Hon. and Rev. A. P. Perceval, in a pamphlet styled, “A collection of Papers connected with the Theological Movement of 1833.” This fixes its date; it is not yet of ten years’ standing, and mark the speed of its development! The opinions of this party have found their way, by the testimony of friends and foes, into, perhaps, every colony of Great Britain, as well as the Continent of Europe, and have taken up a strong-hold in Scotland. As yet, thank God, they have made little progress in Ireland.

The names of the prime movers are given. Mr. Perceval appears himself in the van. Indeed there is a most manifest acting of the fly on the chariot-wheel throughout the whole of this pamphlet. He is quite resolved not to lose, in the character of an autobiographer, any thing of what, perhaps, some would be tempted to call a “bad eminence.” Dr. Pusey was not among the very first to move in the design, but soon after joined. The others were the Rev. Messrs. Froude, Keble, Newman, and Rose. These, with Messrs. Perceval and Pusey, formed what may be styled the Heptarchate of the Oxford movement. I believe this was the original band of “conspirators” against the Church’s peace. It will be evident, by a glance at the above names, that they did not come to the matter unprepared. The germ of the system is found in Professor’s Keble’s poetry, as even some of his own admirers and imitators confess. The man who could pen such lines as the following (and many such specimens might be found) had not far to go to become a thorough Puseyite.

Spoken of a tear shed for sin, we have this sentiment:—

“Let it flow on, till all thine earthly heart,
In penitential drops have ebbd away.”

And again, of the Virgin Mary and our Divine Redeemer—

“His throne thy bosom blest,
O, Mother undefiled,—
That throne, if ought beneath the skies
Beseems the sinless child.”—*Christian Year*.

This may be poetry, but it is hardly Protestant truth.

Some of your readers too, may have seen the trashy, inflated, and flippant Popery which teems in the “Remains” of the unhappy Froude, published and prefaced by Mr. Newman, shortly after his death. Of the rest of the “conspirators” little need be said here. Their first regular meeting was at Mr. Rose’s house, in Hadleigh, Suffolk. It was in the shape of a conference, and lasted five days, beginning on Thursday and ending on Monday, in July, 1833, and the result was the following matured statement of opinion, which has been since carried into practical effect, with fearful success. I give it in Mr. Perceval’s words:—

“1. That the only way of salvation is the partaking of the body and blood of our sacrificed Redeemer.

“2. That the means expressly authorised by Him for that purpose is the holy sacrament of His supper.

“3. That the security by Him, no less expressly authorised for the continuance and due application of that sacrament, is the Apostolical

commission of the bishops, and under them the presbyters of the Church.

“4. That under the present circumstances of the Church in England, there is peculiar danger of these matters being slighted and practically disavowed, and of numbers of Christians being left or tempted to precarious and unauthorised ways of communion, which must terminate often in virtual apostacy.”

Now, Sir, any candid reader may perceive in the above extracts one or two leading features: these constitute the essence of Puseyism, and will serve the practical purpose at which I aim in these communications—just to draw out and exhibit them.

1. There is an *indistinctness*, or rather *ignorance*, as to the great and fundamental *doctrine of Justification*: it is not specifically alluded to, but is virtually superseded by what follows.

2. Salvation is represented as coming through the sacraments—i. e. *sacramental justification* is taught.

3. The *Sacrament of the Lord's Supper* is alluded to with what must be feared is a *designed ambiguity*, in connexion with the “*partaking of the body and blood of our sacrificed Redeemer*.”

4. The *Ministry of the Episcopal Church in England* is spoken of in the way of *undue exaltation*, and so as to give needless offence, by the *exclusiveness of the terms* used.

These, Sir, are, by their own account, the *principia* of the Puseyite school, and we are bound to acknowledge the account a true one. Wherever these principles are held, with more or less of tenacity, there is the beginning of Puseyism. I shall, God willing, in a future letter, trace the development of this systematized form of error.—I remain, &c.

LETTER IX.

WHAT IS PUSEYISM?—No. 3.

SIR,—In my last I gave, and on their own authority, the principles from which the bodies in the Tractarian movement started. One of the means employed (indeed the most successful) has been the dissemination of their opinions through the press, and by the tracts whence they derive their distinctive name. The development of the system is best seen by a reference to these papers, and as, perhaps, few of your readers have either time or inclination to pursue such an inquiry for themselves, I shall, God willing, in some future papers endeavour to aid them by a glance at the Oxford divinity thus, in the way of selection.

Before doing so, however, it may be well just to look for a moment at the issues of the movement thus begun. Your readers were presented with a history of its apparently inconsiderable origin in the summer of 1833; let them now look at the result. Were any person *then* to have characterized this attempt as pro-Popish, or leading to apostacy from our Protestant faith, he would, perhaps, have been dubbed a fool, or cried down as a low-church alarmist. But now we can see where these Church principles, as they are called, have landed their followers.—

Hear one of them, *the Rev. Mr. Palmer, Fellow and Tutor of St. Mary Magdalene College, Oxford.* Thus he writes:—

“I tell you plainly, that for myself *I utterly reject and anathematise the principle of Protestantism* as a heresy, with all its forms, sects, or denominations. And if the Church of England should ever unhappily profess herself to be a form of Protestantism (which may God in his infinite mercy forbid!) then I would reject and anathematise the Church of England, and would separate myself from her immediately, as from a human sect, without giving Protestants any unnecessary trouble to procure my expulsion. In conclusion, I once more publicly profess myself a Catholic, and a member of the Catholic Church, and say anathema to the principle of Protestantism (which I regard as identical with the principle of Dissent), and to all its forms, sects, and denominations, especially to those of the Lutherans, Calvinists, and British and American Dissenters.”

These were this gentleman's opinions last year; as to his whereabouts at present, I am ignorant, but I think few of your readers would feel surprise, however they might be grieved, to hear that he had reached Rome, whither he was, when thus writing, so evidently and rapidly wending his way.

This, however, is far from a solitary instance of the same kind of spirit. The above is a reference to opinions; I shall state one or two facts.

It has been, then, printed and published before the empire, by a most respectable Minister of the Church, a resident of many years' standing in the University of Oxford (the Rev. Mr. Golightly) that another of the Fellows of that place, during the vacation of last year, *spent part of it on a visit to Dr. Wiseman*, the Romish Bishop, at Oscott, the Jesuits' College. During the same period, as he informs us, another Romish Bishop had been staying at the Mitre Inn, Oxford, receiving visits from several members of the University. It will be observed that *Mr. Sibthorpe* left Ryde to go to Oxford, and thence to this very place (Oscott), on a similar errand, and we know the result. These are but a few facts, and, perhaps, not the most recent or glaring, connected with head-quarters, but they may for the present suffice.

Let us now hear Dr. Pusey himself. In his last published letter, addressed to the Archbishop of Canterbury, he has these emphatic words:—

Speaking of “*the temptation to young and susceptible minds to forsake our communion for that of Rome,*” he has the following plain admission—

“Here I wish to speak on one subject only; the real actual temptations to which, *in the present state of things, a certain class of minds is exposed.*”

That temptation is, as Dr. Pusey has just stated it, to join the Church of Rome. It is true he speaks of it as but a temptation, and to be resisted; it is true, further, that he ascribes it to a very different cause from that to which I now refer it, but the fact is fully admitted. Let us hear the Doctor's method of accounting for this calamity, and dissuading young and susceptible persons from falling into the snare:

“Whatever momentary difficulties (he says) it may give rise to, we must *acknowledge, thankfully*, that in England the Roman Communion has, amidst its sad errors, from which it will not part, *a degree of life and holiness* which in our earlier days it had not.”

This, and much more to the same effect, is the Doctor's method of settling the matter. I must confess myself quite unconvinced by such arguments. The common-sense way to account for the Rome-ward movement here admitted, is just to lay it at the right door, and that one is his own and his compeers in Tractarianism.

Now, Sir, I ask what clearer evidence can we require of the tendency of these opinions; and yet this very individual is one of those who has come in for no small share of praise for *good intentions*, and *laudable zeal*, from some of the rulers of our Church. This very man, who, during his visit to Ireland, some months back, had the temerity to enter a Romish mass-house and worship there, during the performance of that service, which he had on oath styled idolatrous. This, I repeat it, is the man, who, when publicly convicted, and on the testimony of a Romish Priest, with having knelt and worshipped at his altar, justified himself by the plea of not having bowed his head, though he bent his knee. A *nice distinction*, truly, for a Protestant pastor, a Fellow of Oxford, a teacher of the youth of our country! And this, Sir, is the gentleman whom some of our prelates have designated "a distinguished individual," whom, while they slightly and mildly censure, they virtually support and commend. I desire not to deal in invective; I return to fact and statement. Here, then, is Dr. Pusey's own testimony, that whatever were the intentions of those who set on foot this movement, and commend the publication of the Tracts, a tendency to join the Church of Rome has manifested itself, and I hesitate not to add, in consequence of them.

But why need I speak of a tendency? Messrs. Spencer, Sibthorpe, and several others, have gone the whole road thither; it is asserted, on good authority, that of the 200 resident members of the convocation in Oxford, at least one-fourth are Tractarians. The printing and importation of *Romish Breviaries*, for the use of professing Protestant students and others, has become a gainful speculation to the English booksellers. It may have fallen to the lot of others (as it has to my own) while travelling in England, to meet with companions who take advantage of a railway carriage, or a steam-boat cabin, to read their "*hours*" from these newly-imported books of devotion. Nor is this to be wondered at: the *beauties of the Breviary*, in the way of poetry, are much sought after by those who should know better: and while the most devotional and Scriptural compositions of Protestant writers are sneered at, as savouring of the conventicle, the hymns of the Romish Church are versified for the use of members of our Protestant communion.

This, Sir, reminds me of another way in which we may come at the truth as regards the nature of Puseyism. *How do Romanists speak of it?* Let us see. I select just one instance; it is an extract from a Romanist periodical, published on the Continent, and not one of the most recent date either. Thus states *L'Ami de la Religion*, of Oct. 5, 1841:—

"It is useless again to go through the doctrines maintained by the new school of theology in the University of Oxford, named after its leader, the School of Pusey. We have several times detailed the remarkable concessions made to the Catholics by this rising generation of Protestant theologians, who are either more candid or better informed than their predecessors. We have mentioned in particular the

Tracts for the Times, published periodically by the partisans of these new doctrines. * * There is no doubt that it is the intention of the celebrated Professor Pusey to effect the re-union, if he and his party can muster strength enough, of the two Churches of England and Rome."

To believe the truth of this assertion, or assert it, might be deemed uncharitable, but does it admit of any doubt as to the direct tendency of the *Tracts for the Times*?—I remain, &c.

LETTER X.

WHAT IS PUSEYISM?—No. 4.

SIR,—In a former letter, while tracing to its source this pernicious system, I felt it necessary to observe, that one mark of its existence is "*indistinctness*, or rather *ignorance*, as to the great and *fundamental doctrine of Justification*." This will appear manifest by a reference to the writings of the Tractarians. I allude to it now, and thus prominently, for several reasons.

And first, in order to show the real importance of the question at issue between all who value our reformed religion and those innovators. Now, it cannot be denied that great and serious differences of opinion exist, and have ever existed, between various communions of Protestants. Yet in one respect they all agreed, and do still agree wherever an adherence to vital truth remains. This rallying point ever has been the fundamental doctrine of Justification by Faith only. It were an easy and not an ungrateful task to point out this uniformity of sentiment in the confessions of the English, Scotch, and Continental Protestant Churches; and this symbolizing here has ever been a healing oil in the else painful wounds which controversy on minor points has produced among us. It has been more—it has afforded a reply, and often a convincing one to the advocates of Rome, in their boasted unity. We have been enabled to point to a similar, yea and a much more strict and consistent as well as Scriptural union of opinion, upon this point, at least, than any which the adherents of Popery could boast. Thus it might be said in a sense, of these Churches of the Reformation, as well as others agreeing in this gloriously fundamental truth, as the heathen poet once said of a sister-band—

"Facies non omnibus una :
Nec diversa tamen, qualis decet esse sororum."

Now, one great evil, if not the very greatest of the Puseyite school is, that it has gone far to break up this union; and, in making the attempt, endeavoured to draw its adherents in quest of an opposite alliance toward Rome. In other words, it seeks for grounds of union not in purity of doctrine or agreement on this great truth of the Gospel, but on *similarity in the external regime of the Church*. In proof of this, I appeal to the Tracts themselves. So early as the first vol. (No. 36), we have "an account of religious sects at present existing in England." These are divided under a threefold head. 1. Those who reject the truth. 2. Those who receive and teach a part, but not

the whole of the truth, *erring in respect of one or more fundamental doctrines*. 3. Those who teach more than the truth. Under the first head we find Socinians, Jews, Deists, and Atheists. The second comprises *Presbyterians, Independents, Methodists, Baptists, Quakers, &c.* While in the third we find Romanists or Papists, New Jerusalemites, Southcotonians, and Irvingites.

I do not know how the various classes of persons here alluded to may feel with respect to the alliance which has been thus contracted for them with others; but one thing must be evident, namely, that the union among Protestants just alluded to, has been not only disregarded, but, so far as the Puseyite faction can avail, entirely broken up by this categorical arrangement of religious sects. Under the second head we find those, many of whom we were accustomed to look upon as brethren, unceremoniously set down as "*erring in one or more fundamental doctrines*," (the italicising is their own) and when we come to examine what these doctrines are, the matter is made still worse: here are specified and dwelt on, such matters as "the validity of ordination by presbyters," opposition to ecclesiastical government, the manner of the administration of the Sacrament of Baptism, &c. all these are expressly styled "*fundamental doctrines*," while, throughout the whole classification, not even when exposing the errors of Rome, is the slightest allusion made to THE FUNDAMENTAL DOCTRINE of Justification by Faith only. Thus is the great bond of Protestant and Christian union recklessly broken by those disturbers of the true Church's peace.

Now, Sir, I am not one of those who, under the guise of misnamed liberalism, would make light of the "unhappy divisions" which keep from visible union the body of Christ's believing and professing people. With many of the sects and parties above-enumerated, as a conscientious minister of the Church of England, I am at issue, and with some of them on really "fundamental" points: I trust it will be needless to specify which I intend. But I cannot, on this account, assent to that infatuated view of right and wrong, which would thus heedlessly break up the fraternal concord which I know existed among the Fathers of the Reformation, and which thus knit into one holy bond of opposition to Anti-Christ such men as Bucer and Martyr, Calvin and Zuinglius, as well as Luther and Melancthon, with our own sainted Cranmer, Ridley, and Latimer.

There is another point in this mistiness and confusion about Justification among Tractarians, which it is most important to observe. It proves that *this error is no new thing*. The fact is, that such a school of divinity has always existed among the members of the Church of England. It may be a humiliating confession, but it is as well, on all accounts, that it should be known. It would be no very difficult matter to make out a *Catena* of writers and teachers, even of the Established Church, who, more or less closely, resemble the Oxford school. To do this, we need only go to their Tracts, and there we shall find abundant evidence that such is the case. The leading point of resemblance among them is unsoundness on this point—Justification. This was Laud's fundamental error—it is manifestly the prevailing one in the system of such men as Bishop Bull: with all his opposition to Popery as a system, and his scholastic erudition, there is a want of soundness here. The same may be observed in many others. Jeremy

Taylor, for instance, with all his exuberance of imagination and occasional depth of piety, is of the same school. And more recently Mr. Knox, who may, indeed, be in some measure viewed as the father of it in our own day.

Here, then, is a painful but important truth—there have been always men of a similar stamp to Dr. Pusey and his coadjutors in Tractarianism, in our Church. These latter gentlemen have merely the merit of combining into a system elements of error which were previously in existence. The whole essence of Puseyism is to be found in the writings of men who were known as authors long before Dr. Pusey ever published a single tract. This will be most apparent from an examination of their respective views on the single subject concerning which I now write—Justification; and error here is indeed deadly error. Hence, too, the means of accounting for an else exceedingly marvellous fact—the *popularity* of the views thus propounded. The modern propounders of these views have been merely the standard-bearers of old and inveterate error; they have simply unfurled the banner, inscribed with erroneous and pernicious views of Justification, and similar grievous misrepresentations of the truth, and the consequence has been, a gathering around them of those who long held similarly erroneous opinions. We can, by this means, and it is of great moment though simple, see the value of their assertions who, while notoriously tinged with Puseyite error, deny that they belong to the party thus designated. The name is now, here at least, (and I thank God for it) an unpopular one; but the eschewing of it is far from enough. It has come to this, and I trust to be spared to show it, that every teacher of God's truth is bound, if he be faithful, to protest against this God-dishonouring error. It will not satisfy, nor should it, those who value the pure and Protestant doctrines of the Reformation, that any minister of our Protestant Church may think himself secure under the shield of a denial of Puseyism, while he yet holds and teaches (or if he do the former without the latter it is only the worse) the essential errors of that system.

These observations will afford grounds for our reply to the question which heads them—does any ask “What is Puseyism?” I fear not to assert, that an essential and integral part of it consists in unsound views on the subject of Justification.—I remain, &c.

LETTER XI.

WHAT IS PUSEYISM?—No. 5.

SIR,—It is an inexpressibly painful assertion of any opinions, or the upholders and abettors of them, to say that they err on a fundamental point, when the truth of the Gospel is concerned; and yet, if Scripture speak plainly any where it is here—“He that believeth and is baptised shall be saved, he that believeth not shall be damned.” Faith is such a fundamental—to reject the one object of it is to forfeit salvation—to incur everlasting ruin. To trifle, tamper with, obscure this one

means of eternal security, is to err fundamentally ; and I hesitate not to assert, however painful the duty, that Puseyites, one and all—from the prime movers in this execrable sedition against the saving truths of the Gospel, down through their approvers, apologists, abettors, to their most covert partisans, are guilty of this fearful crime. In a word, I cannot look upon the adherents of this party in any other light than as either totally off the true and only foundation for a sinner's hope ; or else like “a bowing wall” so far inclined to the side of dangerous and deadly error, that some further impulse may urge them down, whither help may never come. And why? They err, they all err, more or less, in a fundamental point, and that is *Justification*.

I feel this is not the place for a theological disquisition on a point which has exercised the minds and pens of the profoundest thinkers and writers, since the era of the blessed Reformation, and before it, to our own day ; and yet, as the truth here is simple, because clear and scriptural, we may venture briefly to state it, and thus see its awful contrast in Puseyite and Romanist darkness. A sufficient statement on this all-important subject is, that in the Apostle's epistle to the Church in Galatia (chap. ii. v. 16) “A man is not justified by the works of the law, *but by the faith of Jesus Christ*.” Would any person enter deeply into the spirit and meaning of this and the numerous similar passages with which the writings of St. Paul abound, let him read *Luther's Commentary on Galatians*. Thus, again and again, asserts the Reformer—“*This is the true mean to become a Christian, even to be justified by faith in Jesus Christ.*”

This was the simple and glorious truth which won the Reformation ; its blessed light was kindled simultaneously in the hearts of Luther and of our own holy Cranmer, having descended to them from its still more early scintillations in the soul of Wickliffe, as well as the earlier witnesses of it in the secluded valleys of Piedmont. Was there no other argument for its heavenly origin, we should find it in its suitability to the case of every sinner who receives the teaching of God's Spirit—it is just what he needs—it meets his case, and meets it at once and fully. From the trembling enquirer in Philippi's dungeon, to the latest convert from unbelief to saving righteousness, the only response which will speak instant and effectual comfort to his agonised enquiry after an escape from the coming wrath of God, is this gloriously simple and effectual one—“Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ and thou shalt be saved.” And what do Puseyites? They dare to cast the shade of vain and worthless ritualism—to interpose the cloud of revived Romish error between the trembling enquirer and this—the shining forth of Gospel brightness.

Hence, I repeat it, their truly lamentable error ; hence the incumbent duty of every one, lay or cleric, in public or in private, who values the blood-bought jewel of pure Reformation doctrine, to protest against their deadly presumption.

And now, Sir, to the proof. Are my assertions of such error on the part of this faction founded or not? In order to consult brevity as much as possible, I shall just present, in parallel columns, the doctrine of Scripture and the Church of England, as well as the teaching of Rome and Oxford, and then let your readers judge for themselves :—

"Therefore, we conclude, that a man is justified by faith without the deeds of the law."—*Romans* iii. 28.

"*Being justified by faith*, we have peace with God, through our Lord Jesus Christ."—*Rom.* v. 1.

"We are accounted righteous before God, only for the merits of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, by faith, and not for our own good works or deservings. Wherefore, that we are justified by faith only is a most wholesome doctrine, and very full of comfort, as more largely is expressed in the Homily of Justification."—*Article XI. of the Church of England.*

See also the Homily, as above cited.—*Passim.*

"Whosoever shall say, *that a sinner is justified by faith only*, understanding thereby that nothing beside is required which may co-operate for the procuring of the grace of justification, and that it is totally unnecessary he should be prepared and disposed for it by the motion of his own will—let him be accursed."—*Council of Trent.*

"Whosoever shall say, that man is justified solely by the imputation of Christ's righteousness, or solely by the remission of sins, *exclusive of grace and charity*, which are *diffused in their hearts by the Holy Spirit*, and *instruments therein*, or that justifying grace is merely the favour of God—let him be accursed."—*Ibid.*

"Whosoever shall say, that justification, when received, is not *preserved*, and moreover, *increased* before God, by means of good works, &c. * * * Let him be accursed."—*Ibid.*

"Whosoever shall say, that the Sacraments of the New Law are *not necessary to Salvation*, and that *without them*, or the desire for them, *by faith alone*, men receive justification before God.—* * * Let him be accursed."—*Ibid.*

Such, Sir, is the teaching of Rome, as contrasted with the truth on this subject. Let me now give your readers a specimen of Rome's counterparts:—

"If they (the regenerate) were justified only by imputation of Christ's obedience, they could only please him by that obedience; but so far as they are allowed to please him, *so far they may be said to justify themselves.*"—*Newman on Justification*, p. 58.

"Christ, then, does not keep the power of justification solely in his own hands, but by his Spirit dispenses it to us in due measure, *through the medium of our own doings.*"—*Ibid.*

"Perhaps our Lord's declaration, that the 'righteousness' wherein we must stand at the last day, *is not this our imputed obedience, but our good works.*"—*Ibid.* p. 60.

"Faith, then, considered as an instrument, is always secondary to the sacraments."—*Ibid.* p. 265.

In the comment, also, which Tract 90 offers on our XIth Article, we have as follows:—

“When Faith is called the *sole instrument*, this means the sole *internal* instrument, *not the sole instrument of any kind*.”

“Nor does the sole instrumentality of faith interfere with the doctrine of *works being a mean also*.”—*Ibid*.

“We are justified by Christ alone, in that he has purchased the gift, by faith alone, in that faith asks for it, by baptism alone, for baptism conveys it, and by newness of heart alone, for newness of heart is the life of it.”—*Ibid*.

To these specimens of Tractarian teaching, I shall add but one other, viz., the opinion of a Down and Connor Ecclesiologist, as given anonymously in the *Ulster Times* a few weeks since :—

“Justification by faith stands, as it were, at the threshold of the Christian religion: *it is made ours by baptism*—for we believe one baptism for the remission of sins—and is *again made ours on every subsequent repentance* of any lapse from the obligations of the baptismal covenant. That pardon or remission *returns or departs with our repentance*, like the ebbing or flowing of the sea; but the final justification or pardon stands nowhere but at the gate of heaven.”

Now, Sir, I appeal to your readers on two points:—First, is the teaching of the Church of England, or is it not, in strict accordance with God’s word, on this soul-saving point of doctrine? If they be Protestants, they will, I am sure, find no difficulty in replying. Secondly, then, I appeal to them to say whether or not the teaching of the Church of Rome, and that of Puseyism (and I may add, *its covert Ecclesiological admirers*) are not here identical, and equally removed from Scripture and Protestant truth? Would to God that my brethren of the Church of England would arise, and as one man thunder in the ears of that Church’s appointed rulers, and of Royalty itself, another question. Why then, in the name of Protestantism, reason, and Scripture truth, are traitors to all that is valuable among us, as Christians, tolerated, approved of, fostered, in the very bosom of our National Church?—I remain, &c.

LETTER XII.

WHAT IS PUSEYISM?—No. 6.

SIR,—If your readers agree with me, as I have little doubt many of them do, in the importance to be attached to the doctrine of *Justification by faith only*, they will be content to bestow a little more attention on the manner in which Puseyites have endeavoured first to mystify and then corrupt it. The manifest agreement between their teaching and that of the Church of Rome, as given in my last, has not, I would hope, been forgotten. That teaching is at direct variance with the express statements of the Church of England, on every point; nor could any thing short of the tortuous sophistry of Tract 90, and the Romish ingenuity of conscience to be found among the disciples of the Oxford school, reconcile the facts of a professed minister of our Protestant religion holding such views on this fundamental point, and remaining in the communion of our National Church. The discordance of opinion alluded to should be carefully noted.

1. As to the *ground* of justification. The Church of England, and all orthodox Protestant Churches of the Reformation, hold this to be the finished *work of Christ*, wrought out *for us*, by *Him*, and therefore a *thing ab extra*, and totally *independent of us, our doings or deservings*.

2. The *nature of justification*. In the language of the excellent Dr. O'Brien, the present Bishop of Ossory, in his lucid and learned sermons on this point, it may be briefly stated as a "judicial declaration of innocence" by God himself concerning us. Hence it is an act of omnipotence, effected once and for all; of which, the believer in the Gospel receives the comfort, in the well-grounded and Scriptural assurance that he is its subject. Hence, too, it will be perceived that it admits of no degrees—like God's work of redemption, or of creation (its prototype), "*it is finished*."

3. The *means*. This is *simply and exclusively faith*, exercised on the word of God, and resting on the work of the Redeemer.

I need not enter upon any proof here; a bare reference to the Scriptures quoted in my last letter, and the XIth Article of the Church of England, will suffice. But how now stands Puseyism with respect to these distinct views of this one vital truth? It is opposed to every one of them, as is its foster-mother, Romanism.

1. With them the *ground* of Justification is an *inward work*. Hear Mr. Newman (Sermons on Justification, p. 167):—

* * * "Christians are justified by the communication of an *inward, most sacred, and most mysterious gift*."

2. Its *nature* with them is different—not as Scripture and the Church of England teach, that it is effected fully, finally, gloriously, when we believe—with Puseyism as with *Trentism*, it is a progressive, as well as inward work. Thus writes Mr. Newman again (p. 168):—

"In this sense, then, Justification *does admit* of increase and of degrees; and whether we say Justification depends on faith or on obedience, *in the same degree that faith or obedience grows, so does Justification*."

Now this is just to take our salvation, in its finished state, as wrought out for us by God's own hand, from the Rock of ages, and plant it on the shifting sand of human merit, or human feeling—or, to adopt the language of the *Ecclesiologist*, in the *Ulster Times*—to transfer our regards from the unfathomed depths of the ocean of God's eternal and changeless love, to "the ebbing or flowing of the sea" of human deservings, whereby we may have the comfort of knowing that "*pardon or remission returns or departs with our repentance!*" "Miserable comforters" are ye Puseyites!

3. The *means* with them and us are, if possible, still more widely diverse. "By faith," saith Scripture—"By faith only" repeats the Church of England. Thus, too, writes the excellent Hooker (Discourse on Justification):—

"*Christ hath merited righteousness* for as many as are found in Him. In Him God findeth us if we be faithful; *for by faith we are incorporated into Christ*."

I need not take up time, by repeating what I have already shown, that the *sacraments* (especially that of baptism), and not faith, are, according to Oxford authorities, *THE means* of justification. In ad-

dition to the references already given, I shall only quote as follows from Mr. Newman (Tract 90):—

* * * “They (the sacraments) are the *only justifying rites, or instruments of communicating the atonement*, which is the one thing necessary for us.”

Now, Sir, I leave the contrast between Puseyism and the Church of England, on this vital point, as thus exhibited, for your readers’ consideration. Permit me, in the close, to add a word or two of comment.

We may here see, most clearly, how well the original “*conspirators*” (see my first letter) have kept to their text—the inculcation of “sacramental justification.” Thus, too, may I not add, that the second count of the indictment laid against them has been established. “They do greatly err,” and on a fundamental point, when they adopt and commend another *ground*, and another *means* of a sinner’s salvation, from those which God’s word reveals.

Again, the errors here detected point out a true and important reply to a question which is now being asked—What connexion is there between *Ecclesiology* and *Tractarianism*? or, as a “*Looker on*” has lately put it, with great *naïvete*, in the *Ulster Times*—that he cannot perceive how the “Church Accommodation Society” of these Dioceses ought to be affected by the late move of many of its active members toward the adoption and carrying out the principles of the “Cambridge Camben Society.” Now, Sir, my answer is this:—Error in doctrine and practice are intimately connected. When men choose to substitute the *sacraments* as the means of justifying righteousness instead of faith, what is the natural consequence? The PULPIT for the *preachers*, and the PEWS for the hearers of the Gospel, will be displaced from our churches—the *stone font* and the ALTAR will be exalted—the *baptistery* re-introduced for the reception of the former, and the *three steps* made apparent in the most sacred chancel for the exaltation of the latter. In a word—Church Architecture on an approved *Catholic* model will be ancillary to these Catholic doctrines. Let our Ecclesiologists say what they will, right-minded and justly suspicious Protestants do not like to see the incipient movements of *such* Church Architecture here. The young and sleeky cub, although its claws may be but incipient and its fangs far from formidable, *may* become a full-grown monster; and the Protestants of Belfast and Ulster have no fancy for fondling such a pet as the Society alluded to, when they see it drawing its milk, and receiving and returning the caresses of the parent lioness, whose sojourn is Cambridge, and den on the banks of the Isis. In plain terms, much as I regret it, I do nevertheless fear, and time will tell whether or not I am correct in my apprehensions, that Ecclesiology has done serious damage to that originally noble institution, the Church Accommodation Society;—and who are to blame? Those persons who have undertaken to intermix its proceedings with those of other institutions, on which lies the taint of Puseyism.—I remain, &c.

LETTER XIII.

WHAT IS PUSEYISM?—No. 7.

SIR,—It may occur to some of your readers that I have gone far enough in attempting a reply to this question, and for practical purposes, perhaps this is the case, at least it ought to be so. I have asserted, and whether with truth or not, your readers have been enabled to judge by the direct quotations given from the writings of the Tractarian school, that they have erred *fundamentally* on the subject of a sinner's *justification*. If this be so, but one course remains for all who desire to, "cleave to that which is good," namely, separation from, and protestation against them. Whoever trenches on the simple, Scriptural, and blessed truth, that "we are justified by faith only," propounds "another gospel," and, were he an angel from heaven, merits no other response to his erring message than "*anathema!*" Error here leads to further and fatal mistakes. Thus we have (as already seen) *Sacramental Justification* taught, and, as a necessary consequence, the most unscriptural, exaggerated, and distorted views of the *ministerial office*. Let us hear the "Tracts" themselves, for instance, speak on this subject; and here, be it remarked, I quote from the very *first volume* of these productions. We have been lately told, and that from high quarters, that *at first* these organs of Puseyism were "harmless," nay contained much that was excellent and sound in doctrine, &c. Let us see. In Tract 10, (vol. 1) we have the "*Heads of a week-day Lecture,*" delivered to a country congregation; and thus this gospel-teacher instructs his people as to his own office, its nature; exhibiting himself as the successor of the Apostles—their imitator in doctrine, &c. To do justice to this awful misrepresentation of the teaching of Christ's religion, wherein *He* who should be its alpha and omega is carefully (as far as regards salvation) excluded, your readers should peruse the entire tract. They may, however, form some idea of it by the following:—

"I who speak to you concerning Christ, was ordered to do so by the Bishop, *he speaks in me, as Christ wrought in him*, and as God sent Christ. Thus the whole plan of salvation hangs together. *Christ the true Mediator above; His servant, the Bishop, His earthly likeness*; mankind the subject of His teaching, God the author of Salvation."

And in the following page, speaking of the time when the laity shall have a proper respect for the priesthood—

"Then you will honour us with a purer honour than you do now, namely, *as those who are entrusted with the keys of heaven and hell*—as the heralds of mercy—as the denouncers of woe to wicked men—as *entrusted with the awful and mysterious gift* OF MAKING THE BREAD AND WINE CHRIST'S BODY AND BLOOD."

I shall not insult the pious feelings of your readers by further extracts from this execrable mine of error—I had almost said, blasphemy. Who does not see here the design of those men, viz. to exalt them-

selves and their office at the expense of Christ and his precious truth: and full well have they gone on in their wicked career thus commenced; for, be it observed, these passages are from the *least* obnoxious of their writing—from those parts which have received *all but unqualified praise in the charges of some who occupy the Episcopal bench.*

Now, Sir, I feel all the responsibility of bringing so grievous a charge against any body of men as that to which I have just given expression, and yet, after careful consideration, I must repeat it. I do not mean to say that their inadvertent admirers, and half-in-half abettors—their apologists and imitators—that *id genus omne* of persons who follow the Tractarian camp are *designedly* doing this mischief; but this I do say—and who will deny it?—that the tendency of the whole system is to exalt the ministry at the expense of Christ and his Gospel. Let any one, for example, examine Tract 17, whose specious title is the following:—“*The Ministerial Commission a trust from Christ for the benefit of his people.*” Here we will see a great shew of humility—an entire renunciation of any arrogated authority, *except to benefit the people of Christ.* What uncommon simplicity of character is here! Our Puseyite teacher says—“Raise us, good people—high!—higher!!—higher still!!!—raise us all;—we are the ‘earthly likeness’ (at least the Bishop is) of —— Shall I allow my pen to make the blasphemous addition? No, Sir, I have already gone far enough in so doing. Your readers can see the drift of it without further comment. “Let the ministry be raised—but mark!—it is all for your benefit—not ours! Oh, no! we poor meek, innocent priests have nothing to do with this exaltation!” Thus they spake in 1833; but observe their speech, and *acting too*, in 1842. Now we *are up*—and what follows? Why just let the poor dupes that raised us sink proportionably. Turn them out of the *choir*, says the ECCLESIOLOGIST, Aye, and say, “*procul profani!*” from the *chancel.* Away with the REWS! He adds—no sitting in high places here. Get you to the NAVE!—good enough for you of the laity. Up with the “*roodscreen!*” Now we shall, for *your special convenience and comfort* (not to raise ourselves, observe), set the HIGH ALTAR in its due elevation; and, if quiet and orderly, you shall have a peep at it, and *see the priest* at his devotions in your behalf!”

Is this misrepresentation? Let any one take the trouble to examine the *excellent* and *useful* papers of the Camden “Ecclesiologist,” so lately and kindly furnished for the use of the people in these Dioceses, and judge for himself. Meanwhile, let us just return for a moment to No. 17. And here, Sir, is the germ of the whole evil—here is priestly exaltation, *for the benefit of the people.* And what does it promise? Great things certainly to the son of the Church: such as the visits of “a duly commissioned minister,” to “quiet his conscience,” “to whom he may come and open his grief, and *receive the benefit of the sentence of God’s pardon,*” &c. I shall not stop to point out how readily this *early tract* may be made to chime in with the practises of Popish confession and absolution: I hasten to the point in hand. In what, then, does all this end? What is it which constitutes this mysterious and wonderfully advantageous gift?—Here it is:—

“And if we are asked by what authority we speak, and who

gave us this authority, we have our credentials at hand—'whosoever sins ye remit they are remitted, and whosoever sins ye retain they are retained,'” &c.

Not a word in the whole of *inward and spiritual fitness* for the office—all is based on the outward call to it. We shall see in another letter, if God will, the *quo tendis* of this *opus operatum* doctrine. Meanwhile, let me, through you, Sir, who have well and disinterestedly (for I will say it) stood in the gap against the coming in of these insidious errors among us, sound another note of warning to my brethren of the laity on this head—let it be to remind them, that, in the matter of our ministry, as in every thing else, Christ and his truth are and should be all. Though Judas had the hands of infinite power laid on him this could not make him an Apostle, nor can any amount of apostolicity in the matter of ordination render men true ministers of Christ who teach what is against His truth.—I remain, &c.

LETTER XIV.

THE ARCHDEACON OF DOWN'S PAMPHLET.

SIR,—I must once more claim your indulgence for a temporary departure from the subject I have lately had in hand (the exposure of *Puseyism*), while digressing so far as to notice some passing events of perhaps equal moment. Neither you nor your readers will, I feel persuaded, think this digression uncalled for, or wide of the mark, when I state, that one of these events is the appearance of the threatened pamphlet of the Archdeacon of Down, on the subject of the Church Accommodation and Church Architectural Societies. You have already had the honour of introducing this production to your readers' notice, so that they will perhaps feel small surprise when they find your correspondent following your example, by reason of the conspicuous place which its Venerable author has assigned to me therein. In noticing his observations, I desire, for convenience' sake, to mark with precision the share which I have in them—a matter, indeed, of no great difficulty.

The gentleman alluded to has selected, as the burden of his defence of the two societies, *one paragraph* from your journal, and *one fact*, or collection of facts, viz. those connected with the building of *Tyrella Church*. Now, with neither of these has "Clericus Connorensis" any personal connexion whatever, inasmuch as he furnished neither the paragraph nor the facts in question. Both these are yours, Sir, and I leave them with you, merely congratulating the Archdeacon on the manner in which he seems likely to come out of the controversy, wherein, by his own free will, as the *Promachus of Ecclesiology* in these parts, he has entangled himself. I ought not to forget your contemporary "*The Dublin Statesman*," whom he has likewise challenged to the combat; and, if I am not very much mistaken, the venerable gentleman will be glad, before all is done, that he had let you both alone.

With the following sentence, however, I have to do, and properly with it only:—

"I seldom see the newspaper from which this extract is made, and should probably have known nothing about it, had not my attention been specially directed to it. I am aware that a series of unremitting assaults has been made in that paper against the Church Architecture Society, by a person who dares not affix his name to the SLANDEROUS INSINUATIONS he has thought proper to propagate against his Diocesan and his brethren, and who finds it convenient to shelter himself under a general denomination, which I wonder the clergy of the Diocese of Connor do not feel themselves insulted by his assuming. But I have hitherto carefully avoided taking any part in the controversy, and am acquainted with the assaults only from such extracts as have appeared in the answers to them in another publication. I had hoped, indeed, that the absurd and mischievous opposition to the Church Architecture Society would have ceased long ago, when, from the documents we have already published, it might be evident to any candid mind that we have no such superstitious objects as are attributed to us, and when the character of the leading members, many of whom are second to none in their attachment to 'the Church as she is,' and in their opposition to every form of error, might be a sufficient guarantee of the principles on which the Society would be conducted."

Little need be said concerning the *language* here employed; perhaps it may be idiomatic in *Oxford*, but certainly it is new to my ideas, I will not say of what becomes a clergyman but a gentleman. I am free to confess at once my inability to contend in this Archidiaconal style. "*A person who DARES NOT affix his name to his SLANDEROUS INSINUATIONS!*" Perhaps so: (more of this anon); meanwhile I trust by God's grace, *I dare tell the truth*, aye, and proclaim it too, though a more formidable weapon threatened me than the "*brutum fulmen*" of unseemly declamation.

Lest, however, any of your readers might be tempted to mistake such statements as that just quoted for argument (though I confess it seems very unlikely that they would), I proceed to notice some of the assertions contained in it.

But first let me direct your attention, Sir, to the Archdeacon's *modus probandi*. Of course all he has stated concerning "*Clericus Connorensis*" is true, at least he believes it so; but on what grounds? Hear himself:—

"*I am aware that a series of assaults has been made, &c.* * * * But I have hitherto carefully avoided taking any part in the controversy, and am acquainted with the assaults only from such extracts as have appeared in the answers to them in another publication."

Indeed! and so this gentleman has passed his wholesale condemnation on my character and compositions, *having never seen them!* I cannot, of course, speak with certainty of the "*extracts*" to which he refers, but I think it more than likely allusion is made to some strictures on them, which appeared in one of your contemporaries, the very absurdity and ribaldry of which were their best confutations. This, Sir, is not the way in which the Christian religion would have any man pass sentence on another. Ill, indeed, does it agree with His precept who has said—"Judge not lest ye be judged." Surely the objector in question might, at least, have taken the trouble to read over what he thus undertakes to condemn.

So much for the Archdeacon's grounds of accusation. And now

for his assertions—they are contained in the sentence above given, and amount to the following :—

1. That "*Clericus Connorensis*" is guilty of "*slanderous insinuations.*"

2. This is aggravated by their being made and propagated "*against his Diocesan and his brethren.*"

3. And this again is heightened by his "*sheltering himself under a feigned denomination.*"

I shall say a few words respecting each of these charges.

Now, Sir, as to the first and second head of accusation, I have only to say they are false and groundless. Had the Archdeacon perused the papers he condemns, I should have perhaps felt called upon to state plainly that he had been guilty of wilful misrepresentation in making the charge; but inasmuch as he condemns what he has never seen, except in a partial way, I shall content myself with saying that he has been misinformed, and, therefore, mis-stated what these letters contained. At all events, I deny, emphatically and totally, his assertion; and, in reply, say, "*proba domine.*" I have advanced facts, and on these I grounded objections to the ECCLESIOLOGICAL Society.

And, now, Mr. Editor, *I re-assert every one fact originally advanced—I reiterate every objection made and grounded on these facts*; and as the Archdeacon of Down seems to be but imperfectly cognizant of them, I beg leave thus briefly to give a recapitulation:—

First,—I asserted, and here reiterate the assertion, that there was, and is, a connexion of intimacy between the Cambridge Camden Society and the projected Church Architecture Society of these dioceses. It matters little what the nature of that connexion be, whether strict or otherwise. There are, *in the proceedings of both Societies* (the Camden and the Down, Connor, and Dromore), interchanges of mutual good-will and approval—compliments passing and repassing, as well as publications—printed and written documents, and so forth.

Secondly,—I assert that the Camden Society is a most infamous one: that its publications contain the very quintessence of Popish and (*mis-named*) High Church nonsense, so that its original members (some of them, and these the best) have withdrawn from it in disgust. Now, let not the Archdeacon play fast and loose on this point. *Does he approve, or does he condemn, this parent institution?* If the former, why fight shy of the original connection?—if the latter, why not honestly say he is ashamed of the want of judgment exhibited in courting so unholy an alliance? Does the Archdeacon know that the men who originally planned and are now working out the designs of the Camden Society are a clique of young, heady persons in that university? He has given us letters from *two* English prelates—(with what benefit to his case the public may judge); *but why not give us the replies of the Bishops of Chester and Winchester*, who have also seceded from the Camden Society, or did he write to seek their countenance also? No, Sir, this will not do: if the Archdeacon mean to plead the cause of Ecclesiology before the tribunal of public opinion, let him give a full and fair statement of the case—let him exhibit *his own letters*—let him show the case put before the *English Prelates*, and then there will be a better opportunity of passing judgment upon the whole. Does

the influential Protestant layman, part of whose communication is printed in the Archdeacon's letter, really know, or has he seriously weighed the two plain facts just alluded to? Has he *examined the Camden Society's publications*? Has he reflected on the evil consequences of *any connection* whatever with such an institution? Let him do this, and then state plainly what he thinks of the wisdom, and Protestantism, and fair dealing of those who would seek such associations, and use the influence of his name and pen in their defence. But, Sir, in truth, I have neither time nor taste to enter upon a refutation of the Venerable Archdeacon's letter. If *he* thinks it a defence of his favourite Society, it would be almost a pity to undeceive him; whether the public, or at least the thinking part of our own Church, will do so is quite another matter. To them I am quite willing to leave it as it is.

For the *Church Accommodation Society* I never did, and, by God's help, never will say a disparaging word of its excellent design; but this I will say—I fear much the Archdeacon, and its Assistant-Secretary, and its other members, who have turned the committee meetings of the one into *adjournments* for the purpose of planning and working out the other (the Ecclesiological) Society, have done anything but served it. I do much fear public confidence in its guides is shaken, and, before it is restored, the laity must now receive some distinct assurance that the money they are asked to contribute to its funds will be, *bona fide*, expended on *building churches*, not in manufacturing *lecterns, faldstools, &c.* or in *painting windows*, whose hieroglyphics are poor substitutes for the written and preached word of God.

I forbear to enlarge upon the subjects originally presented to the public in the letters alluded to. Were there any occasion I might refer to the *kind of defenders* the Ecclesiological Society has drawn forth—the *doctrinal views on fundamental points*, which they have ventured to advance, &c. &c. but I forbear.

As to the charge of slandering my Diocesan and my brethren, I dismiss it with the contempt it deserves. It is a mere *ad captandum* flourish. I never wrote one line which deserves the censure. If I be unfortunate not to agree with his Lordship in all his opinions, theological or otherwise, I can hardly be charged with slander on that account; and still less if I be constrained to feel, and, if need be, declare, that my views of doctrine and practice are still more widely at variance with those of the "*Oculus Episcopi*," as well as certain Neophyte Oxonians who may happen to be amongst us. Let the Archdeacon, however, adduce the "*slandorous insinuations*" to which he so gratuitously alludes, and I shall then think it time for farther defence than is implied in this direct denial of the truth of his charge.

At present, Sir, I shall trouble you with but one other word further—it is in allusion to my "*feigned denomination*." And with respect to this I have only to say that I mean to retain it. It is quite as available to me as that of "*A Clergyman of Down*" to another party. Perhaps the Archdeacon may not have altogether forgotten a late occasion, when a clergyman of the adjoining diocese came forth into print on the subject of *canonical obedience*, in another public journal. Perhaps he may recollect his grateful retreat, when "*A Clergyman of Connor*" proved, if not to his satisfaction, at least to that of the public, that his positions were arrogant and untenable beyond the endurance of Protestant and Scriptural principle. If other gentlemen, when it suit

their convenience, use "*feigned denominations*," I mean to do so when it suits mine; nor shall empty and valueless threats drive me from it. *Facts are facts*, and common sense as well as Scriptural truth, will, with God's blessing, reach those for whom they are meant, not only when coming before them under a real signature, but even when subscribed by yours, truly, &c.

LETTER XV.

WHAT IS PUSEYISM?—No. 8.

SIR,—If your readers have perused with attention my former communications on this head, they will be, I would hope, in same measure prepared to give an answer to this question, or at least receive one. I have not yet done with the subject: the Augean stable of the Tracts, and their kindred productions, has been but partially surveyed, yet enough has been done to let in a sufficient quantity of the light of Scripture truth, to guide the eyes of Protestants in a survey of the deformed rubbish which Dr. Pusey & Co. would palm off upon them as valuable teaching and Catholic Christianity. You will observe I still adhere to the name which I have given to this system—I call it *Puseyism*. The Archdeacon of Down mourns over this, in his lately published pamphlet, as follows:—

"But there is also an Oxford Architectural Society, with which we have been taken into connexion; and it is supposed by some, and boldly asserted by others, that this, and everything else in Oxford must be what is called Puseyite. Alas! that one who has painfully disavowed being the leader of a party in the Church, should still, by the pertinacious malice of opponents, be so distinguished; and that those who have disclaimed being called after any human teacher, should still be branded with a designation, which is, in fact, as it is intended to be, an insult."

Now, notwithstanding this lugubrious defence of the gentleman in question, I still prefer to call his favourite system by his own name. Whence, I would ask, did Arianism, and Socinianism, with the elder systems of error, such as Manicheism and Origenism, get their names? From their founders or early cultivators. And, surely Dr. Pusey, who during his visit to Ireland, gave us such a speaking exhibition of Catholic Christianity, should not soon be forgotten among Irish Protestants and Churchmen. This "*distinguished individual*," who paid such becoming reverence to Popish practices and places of worship—kneeling at the altars of Rome, and conducting his family to be fellow-worshippers with her victims—surely we can do no less than give him his due pre-eminence, in Ireland at least, among Tractarian leaders. Therefore, Mr. Editor, notwithstanding Archdeacon Mant's sorrow on the occasion, I continue to expose Puseyism.

But *what is Puseyism*? It is *Popery*. There is but a lath and plaster partition between the two: only the *roodscreen* between the *penetrable* of Romish abomination, and those who worship in the outer court. Puseyism errs, and *errs with Rome*, in the matter of a sinner's *justification*, and, therefore, I am not nice about matters of *verbiage*.

Puseyism is Popery—nay, when we reflect that the upholders of the former system eat the bread and serve at the altars of a *Protestant* church, I go farther and say, Puseyism is Popery, without even the honesty, such as it is, of its sister in error. Did this charge need further confirmation, I would refer to the doings of both systems: *priestly exaltation, exclusive bigotry, dishonour cast upon God's word*, by raising to a parallel authority *human tradition*—these, and many more, are marks of their identity in all that is essential.

Further, *Puseyism* is *Pharisaism*; an elder and kindred form of deadly error. Two words distinguish truth and falsehood in religion—these are, FAITH and SIGHT. The one deals with, and rests in, an unseen Saviour—an unseen (though felt and realised) spiritual manifestation to the soul of the believer—an unseen eternity. The other clings to, and prefers visible and tangible and temporal substitutes for all these. Hence, the *outward form* occupies the place of “the inward and spiritual grace” in sacraments, the ministry, and means of grace.

Now, Sir, compare ancient and modern Pharisaism—they are the same. We have read of the Pharisee of olden date “making broad the phylactery”—extending “the fringes on his garment,” whitewashing the sepulchre, while it was internally unclean and filled with death.—And what is our modern Pharisee doing? Just the same. Hence the fearful and angry disputes which are rending the English branch of our national Church about the *externals* of religion: the colour of a ministerial garment—the position and the points of the compass to which the officiating Clergyman should turn, in reading the prayers of the Church; the shape, and size, and number of the several articles of Church furniture; nay, the very shape and materials of the clothing in which the Church's Ministers should attire themselves, in their every-day walk; all these are warmly disputed among our English brethren—(would to God there were no such vexatious questions flung among ourselves, as fire-brands of controversy)—while the vast concerns of eternity—men's souls, and God's truth—are accounted comparatively of no account.

Whenever, or wherever, Sir, such a spirit as this manifests itself, there is Pharisaism—there is Puseyism. Look at our own immediate neighbourhood. What has the agitation of such questions done? what is it doing here? Our overwhelming population ill supplied with any means of grace—our Church population, in thousands, unprovided with the opportunity of worshipping God—enemies around us, looking on and enjoying these debates about the fooleries and phantasms of church garniture and church architecture—these strifes about rubrics and rituals—while the weightier matters of the soul's salvation are all but forgotten. Is this a true statement of the case, or is it not? If so, and if it be indeed deplorable, where is the wisdom of those who evoked this strife? Well may they look on and tremble at the storm they have summoned forth. But, Sir, much as it is to be lamented, I know not but there is cause of thankfulness in all this. “There must needs be divisions” saith our God, “that those who are approved may be made manifest.” Let us give our Amen to this. “Can two walk together unless they be agreed?” Can, ought two sections of ministers in the same professing church, who are at the very antipodes of truth, as regards *Justification by faith*, for instance, or correct views

of the *Sacramental question*, dwell together in unity? How can Protestant churchmen, and Puseyite fautors be at one? Painful as the alternative may be, I would vastly prefer open and avowed opposition to pretended peace between such parties. Some may style all this rending the peace of the church. To such an accusation I have simply to reply—Who began this controversy?—Who imported Ecclesiology and the Camden Society into Protestant Ulster? Let the consciences of those concerned answer these questions.

But, Sir, I deny, further, that to break up a hollow truce is to rend a solid and Scriptural peace. The true followers of “the Prince of Peace” (I speak with reverence) will ever remember that in another sense even He was “a man of war.” “No peace with Rome!” was the cry of one of the holiest men and brightest ornaments that ever graced the Episcopal bench in our church, and it is full time that the true sons of that church should echo the cry in saying—“No peace with Puseyism!” Does any person ask, “what has all this to do with ourselves—is there any danger impending over us?” I shall, Mr. Editor, in my next, (D.V.) afford a reference to some passing events, in these Dioceses, and then let your readers judge for themselves. Meanwhile, I remain, yours truly, &c.

LETTER XVI.

WHAT IS PUSEYISM?—No. 9.

SIR,—In recurring to this subject, I may be permitted to say a few words, *en passant*, in rejoinder to a letter from the Archdeacon of Down, which appeared in your last. My chief reason for noticing that gentleman’s epistle is, that it presents so marked a contrast to his late pamphlet—being civil. This is its principal merit (and certainly it is comparatively a very great one), for as to fact or argument, there is none. He makes “*three observations*” on my former notice of his pamphlet, and these are almost exclusively relative to the *words* I was led to use.

I.—He writes—

“The Archdeacon, the Assistant-Secretary, and its other members, *have not* turned the committee meetings of the Church Accommodation Society into *adjournments* for planning and working out the Architectural (why does he *nickname* it?) The day of meeting of the one committee was named for the meeting of the other, to suit the convenience of several members of both; but the business of the Church Accommodation Society was never adjourned to make way for the other.”

Now, Sir, as to the mere term “*adjournments*,” I conceive it a matter of little moment. The Archdeacon admits—

1. That the meetings of both Societies have been held on the same day, and at consecutive hours.

2. That they have been held *in the same room*. And here he will permit me to ask the question—how comes this to pass? The rooms alluded to are (or were) the *Clerical Rooms*—paid for and supported by the Clergy of these dioceses, as well as by certain diocesan societies, of

which the Church Architectural Society *is not one*. Were any of the subscribers to these rooms disposed to be litigious, they might very justly demand why were this Society's committee meetings introduced thither without their cognizance or permission. But I let this pass.

3. The Archdeacon admits, or rather assumes, that the committees of the two societies are composed of nearly the same persons.

4. He sets before the public the fact, that an excellent understanding exists between the members of *Church Accommodation* and *Church Architectural Societies*—informing us that

“The committee business of the Church Architecture Society has, on each occasion, been postponed until all the business of the more important society was disposed of.”

I care not, therefore, by what name these kindred committee meetings are called. Here are all the *facts* which I felt it my duty to state to the Protestant public fully admitted. Let me add a few considerations further, and we shall then see the inevitable conclusion. The Archdeacon himself, then, as well as other officers of the *intended Church Extension Society*, are members of the *Ecclesiological* one. The various defenders of the latter, who have come forth for this purpose into the public prints, are members or friends of the former. Of this number, e. g. are its (the Church Accommodation Society) *Assistant Secretary*, Capt. C. M'G. Skinner,—its *Secretary*, the Rev. J. S. Monsell, who has kindly undertaken to enlighten Dr. Drew and myself, in public, on our duties, as members of the Church, to our Diocesan and brethren, as well as more largely on the great command of Christian Charity. I may add, without further notice, the Rev. C. S. Courtenay, clerk, incumbent of Ballymacarrett; and, though last not least, Archdeacon Mant himself, the “*fortis Ajax*” of Ecclesiologism in Ulster. If Ecclesiology (by the way) be a “nickname,” it is due not to me, but if not to its Down and Connor originators, to the parent Camden Society, with its Anglo-Roman-Catholic organ “the ECCLESIOLOGIST.”

Now, Mr. Editor, although Archdeacon Mant has so evident a distaste for facts, I still prefer them: and this will be found to be a fact—that if a new society be formed, or attempted to be formed, on Thursday next, for the professed purpose of *church-building*, its committee of management will consist mainly, if not exclusively, of members of the *Ecclesiological* Society. A few of their names are above given—the president of both being the Lord Bishop, also *Patron* of the *Cambridge Camden Society*. Shall I venture to add somewhat to this? Yes, Sir, I will; for the time has *now* come for speaking out: nor shall the threatening invectives uttered in the committee-room of any society, or more publicly either, by any individual, however exalted in office, prevent me. This, then, I assert, and pledge my accuracy of calculation on the strength of sound Church of England and Protestant principle in Ulster and in Ireland on the issue—that *the Church Accommodation Society is no more*—its death-knell has been rung by the Ecclesiologists, and it will be consigned to its grave on next Thursday. And why? There were not *forty* bona fide subscribers of £5 annually to its revival at its late inaugural meeting. Does the Archdeacon deny this? Let him give their names, and shew the required number, or else argue the public into the belief that *donors* and *subscribers* mean

the same persons. Shall I venture on another predictive assertion? The moral taint which has destroyed one valuable society, will infect (if it have not already infected) and destroy other and similar ones. Yes, Sir, I write it with acutely pained and embittered feelings, yet I feel it to be the truth. The hands which have transplanted the scion of the *Camden Society* into Protestant Belfast, have been, to the cost of much that is good and valuable, placing there a Upas tree, to wither and parch, not alone its formerly flourishing diocesan societies, but the kindness of brotherly feeling which once prevailed among us. I trust to see the day when this ill-omened plant shall cease to tamper with the Protestant feeling of our province, and be plucked up by the roots; meanwhile we have a sufficient specimen of the fruit it is likely to bear.

Talk they of Christian charity indeed! Let them first review their own acts and words, within the past two months, and then go and learn the bitter but salutary lesson of repentance.

II.—The Archdeacon writes—

“None of the money contributed to the fund of the Church Accommodation Society has been expended in *lecterns, faldstools, or painted windows.*”

And to this I have only to reply—I never said so; but this I *now say*—were the two projected societies allowed to walk side by side, and unimpeded among us, I very much fear such would be the case; and, perhaps, some trifle, in the course of time, might be afforded for *credences*, and *chrismatories*, and *confessionals*, and *rood-screens*, as well as some other articles of Church furniture, so interestingly detailed in the *Ecclesiologist*.

III.—The Archdeacon asserts—

“I did not use the expression “*feigned* denomination;” nor did I, on any late occasion, if ever, adopt the denomination of a “Clergyman of Down.” I remember having seen, in the *Ulster Times*, some months ago, a letter under that signature; and I suppose “Clericus Connorensis” thinks, as I believe a “Clergyman of Connor” thought, that I was the author. But I did not write that letter, nor did I know, till some time afterwards, who did.”

And in reply, I have only to say, that either yourself, Sir, or your printers, or I, have mistaken “*feigned*,” *secundum* the Archdeacon, for some other word, and I have no intention of re-perusing his pamphlet to correct my error or yours. I am glad also, for his own sake, that he is not the “Clergyman of Down” to whom I alluded; but here again I must add, *I did not say he was*. My allusion to the circumstance in question serves my purpose quite as well, whoever answers that denomination.

Meanwhile, Sir, I have unintentionally followed the Archdeacon in his “three observations” so far, that I must defer my promised reference to the sayings and doings of incipient Oxonianism among ourselves, to another occasion.—I subscribe myself yours, &c.

LETTER XVII.

WHAT IS PUSEYISM?—No. 10.

SIR,—I recollect once having heard a comparison instituted between the votaries of Rome and *smugglers*; when they have possessed themselves of contraband goods, and are anxious to shun the vigilance of the coast-guard, they not unusually drop their wares in the shallow places of the tide, taking care, however, to have a buoy attached, so that when the danger of pursuit is over, they can repossess themselves of their much treasured goods. So does Rome deal with her wares—her unscriptural and unprotestant doctrines and practices. Enter into dispute with any of her children, who are well instructed in their mother's craft, and they will give you any amount of denial and disclaimer you please, when the eye of Scripture truth is upon them. But bye and bye these very doctrines and practices are hauled up, and you find them in as vigorous existence as ever, when occasion answers.

Now, Sir, I cannot but think we have not a little of this spirit among another set of religionists. You may guess to whom I allude. I have had some little dealings with them, and regret to add, that in all of them I have found a lamentable want of straightforwardness, to call it by no other name. Not long since, what was the cry of the Oxford school?—*Jewel* was “an irreverent dissenter;” *Luther*, a disturber of the Church's peace; *Cranmer*, *Ridley*, and *Latimer* were no martyrs, but headstrong fools; England had but *two martyrs* in the cause of gospel truth—Charles and *Laud*. Now their sayings are in a great measure changed—the horns are drawn in—the sample of Protestant plain feeling they have got has taught them caution, and *the Reformation* is, once more, and for the present, owned to be not quite so bad. Hence, too, the multiplied *disclaimers* with which we are favoured. Mr. Sibthorpe is an unfortunate gentleman—the Church of Rome is, for the present, not “the holy home of Christ” (I shudder to repeat it)—nor are the *Hymns from the Breviary* re-edited and re-translated for Protestant use.

But this won't do, Mr. Editor; Protestants must cease to have discrimination enough to judge between words and acts—their memories must have become very short, indeed, if they can fail to furnish them with a comparison between Tractarianism in its plain speeches, a few months since, and its now subdued tone. The tiger's paw is the same, whether its claws be protruded, or its velvet sheath drawn over them.

In my last I promised a reference to some recent *facts* among us, and I now select one or two, again urging the consideration upon my Protestant fellow-countrymen, that these are of far more moment than honied words and eloquent reclamation. In the *Ulster Times* of the 3d Jan. we are favoured with an account of the consecration of two new churches in the adjoining diocese; and one of these (Kilwarlin, Hillsborough) we are told, has lately been “adorned and beautified by

the addition of a stained-glass window for the Church," which is particularly described as follows, "the design being intended to embody some of the great truths of doctrine and practice belonging to the Church universal." Here is its description:—

"At the top of the centre light is the Triangle contained in a circle, surrounded with rays emblematical of the Trinity in Unity. Lower down, in the same centre light, the name of the Saviour is expressed by the ancient monogram **I. H. S.** and his divine nature by the Greek 'Alpha and Omega.' Beneath these letters are the two tables of the law, containing the Ten Commandments, written at length upon the glass. The lowest compartment of the centre light, and the whole of the two side lights, contain emblems symbolical of the admission of believers into the Church by baptism, and their continuance in it by being 'stedfast in the Apostles' doctrine and fellowship, and breaking of bread and prayers.' 'Baptism,' is symbolized by a Font, over which the mystical Dove is hovering; 'Doctrine,' by an open Bible, standing upon an antique desk, and expanded, so as to show very appropriately at the heading of the pages 'St. John,' and 'Acts;' the Apostles' 'Fellowship' is expressed by a Bishop, sitting in his chair, holding the crozier or pastoral staff in one hand, and raising the other, as in the act of giving the benediction, the figure being copied from some ancient models; 'Breaking of Bread,' by a table covered, and supporting a paten with bread, and a chalice; and 'Prayers' by a minister in his surplice, kneeling at a desk, on which rests an open book with the words, 'Morning Prayer,' legible. These designs are surmounted by imitations of Gothic canopies, and the figures are supported as by Mosaic pavements, having the appropriate words in Old English characters under each. The whole effect of this window is extremely good, and it has been universally admired."

Whether or not you, Mr. Editor, are prepared to join in this *universal admiration* I cannot say, but, certainly, I am not. Is it really come to this, that our people must in this day—proverbial for its spread of knowledge—be taught the fundamental truths of religion by means of hieroglyphics and stained glass windows? All this was very well in the bygone days of Romish and earlier superstition, when the "*biblia pauperum*"—the poor man's bible—was a rude attempt at pictorial representation of the facts and persons of holy writ, with a text or two added; when that Bible was a literally sealed book, and perhaps *some* of such devices as those referred to might be of use.—But that day is gone by—we need no such poor substitutes for the full possession of God's blessed word. One verse of that word tells all that is here contained; and while the latter needs a learned interpreter, to tell us what this glass-window-teaching means, the former needs none but God's blessed Spirit to enlighten his humblest servant who seeks instruction as to the "Apostles' doctrine and fellowship."

I pass over, Sir, what I conceive a most improper attempt (to say the least of it), to symbolize the Blessed Trinity—a TRIANGLE, forsooth. This is just Platonism, refurbished from some such modern source as *Sewel's* Tractarian Essay on *Christian Morals*. Never, by the way, was a greater misnomer. I come simply to this point:—is this the way in which the subscribers to the intended Church Accommodation Society would wish to have their money expended? Is this the way in which the money of any individual may be most ad-

vantageously laid out, just at this time? We hear, almost daily, of the alarmingly low state of the funds of our Diocesan Societies, and yet we see, with pain, that money can be thus lavished on painted windows. *Verbum Sat.*: Let the members of the projected Society see well as to the hands to whose management that Society is proposed to be entrusted.

Once more: is this the *time*, or is ours the *locality*, in which such a taste for church decoration can be harmlessly indulged? The pious members of our own church (or the vast majority of them, I trust and believe,) are justly disgusted with Puseyism in England—the well-disposed portion of our dissenting brethren abhor any semblance of an approach to old superstitions. Are the feelings and wishes of both parties to be recklessly trifled with, to indulge a sickly taste for the mysticism and nonsense of the darker ages? Is this the way to bind the members of our own body in the bands of unity, and to conciliate the good feeling of others? I trow not. If all this do not savour of the Pharisaism which rests in the exterior of religion, to the neglect of its weightier matters, I know not the difference between error and truth—between Puseyism and sound religion. I shall (D.V.) refer to the subject in this point of light again.—Meanwhile, I remain, &c.

LETTER XVIII.

WHAT IS PUSEYISM?—No. 11.

SIR,—I had intended to afford further illustration of the workings of this system, and thereby a direct answer to the above query, by a continued reference to passing events and local circumstances, but for obvious reasons I forbear. Perhaps these reasons may go farther—they may serve to account for my bringing to a close the communications on this particular head, which it has been my privilege, through your kindness, to bring before my Protestant brethren in these parts. It was a sensible, though quaint advice, which a young preacher of my acquaintance once received—namely, always “to stop his sermons when he had done.” The same will apply to writers, and, unless I greatly deceive myself, it does so in the present instance. I think, Sir, I have done sufficiently, for the present at least, with the subject in hand; and for this simple reason, that I find few, if any, clerical or lay, are willing *now* to come forward in its defence. I need not, therefore, try the patience, or hazard an insult to the understanding of your readers by attempting to prove what all admit, that Puseyism is an evil of the first magnitude—that it is disguised Popery—modernized Pharisaism—nay more, *heresy*. I repeat the assertion, Puseyism is heresy. It not alone urges its stormy assaults against the sacred structure of divine truth, as embodied in the Bible, and witnessed to in our Church’s formularies; but, further, it has assailed, by sap and mine first, and at length by manifest violence, the fundamentals of true religion, endeavouring to pluck up and demolish its very cornerstone—namely, the doctrine of a sinner’s justification by faith alone.

But now, Sir, for a weighty consideration. How is this monstrous and confessed evil to be met? In endeavouring to reply, I am fully aware that I enter upon delicate and dangerous ground; never-

theless, believing, as I do, that great things are at stake, I do not, I will not shun it.

The first and most natural quarter to which we would all turn for a remedy is—the *Church's legitimate watchmen and guardians*. The Church's peace is now confessedly broken—the Church's safety, in the opinion of very many, endangered, and that by men within her own bosom. What, then, have her appointed guardians done? Thanks be to God they have not been idle: many of the Bishops of our Church have raised their clear and determined protest against these evil men and their doings. Nor has this been in vain—in every case where the trumpet has thus given no uncertain sound, the spread of such noxious opinions has been checked. I will venture to assert, that in every diocese in the sister-land—and this, where episcopal influence has been thus timely, and firmly, and uncompromisingly exercised—the evil is comparatively unfelt; nor need the faithful followers of our Protestant Reformed Faith fear, under God's blessing, so long as the sword of the Spirit is wielded by the hands of such men as those who now occupy the episcopal charges of Chester, Winchester, Ripon, Llandaff, or our own Ossory and Cashel.

I desire to speak with respect of the Church's chief officers, but can it be wondered at that when heresiarchs have been dealt with in the way of gentle remonstrance, or even scarcely half-concealed and partial approval, so far, at least, as their *earlier* efforts at mischief were concerned, they would be emboldened in these efforts? Such has been the case. The history of *Tract 90*, while it and its author have been thus treated by episcopal authority, and its multiplied editions insult Protestant and Christian feeling, as well as poison unwary and unstable souls, fearfully illustrates such a line of procedure.

But, Sir, to leave particulars and come to the general question, here is a fact with which all who value the truth are bound to deal. Notwithstanding all that has been done by the rulers and inferior clergy in our Church, *the evil is still rampant and encroaching amongst us*. I say "*us*," for our welfare in the Irish Church is bound up with the English branch of the Establishment, as theirs is with ours.

Well, then, Sir, let us look to another source of aid in this matter; and never forgetting that He who ruleth all things in heaven and earth is the first and chief, I repeat what it has been my duty and privilege, more than once, to intimate in these communications, that help is to be found, as it may, and ought to be sought, in THE LAITY likewise. That God to whom I have just referred often moves in a mysterious way. He brings at times light out of darkness, good out of evil, and I verily believe He will do so here. For years, I might, perhaps, say centuries, a deep error has been overlaying the lay part of our communion. It was gendered in the days of Romish error, and has never been thoroughly dissipated. It has been, moreover, sedulously fostered by the disciples of the Oxford school—it is this—that the *Clergy are the Church*, and that the Laity have neither part nor lot in the matter, or nearly so. Here, too, I may remark, that *Ecclesiology*, the handmaid of Puseyism, has been playing her part full well. Hence the adorning and beautifying of the Chancel—the raising up of the *Altar*, and with it the Priesthood, while the people—"ignobile pecus!"—are by degrees ejected to the remote parts of the choir, and finally to the *nave*!

Now, Sir, I maintain that the reverse is the case—*the Clergy and People are the Church*. Let this truth be borne in mind. It is scriptural—"the *apostles* and *elders* and *brethren*" (Acts xv. 23) was the Christian Church's earliest designation, in its first collective capacity; so should it be now—and so, by God's grace, let it be.

I could say much, very much on this subject, but I forbear. The review of the Church's history, even in our own day, as regards the non-adherence to this truth, is most painful. In too many cases, the laity have looked on, and seen their own "holy and beautiful house" defiled, and that without a struggle or remonstrance. What have our temporal *rulers*, in bygone days, done towards our Church here in Ireland? With what kind of men have they filled our Irish Sees? How has the *patronage*, that most holy and responsible part of Episcopal jurisdiction here, been exercised? Let the fearful history of churches emptied, and hireling coffers filled—dissent and schism increased, and the Church's numbers thinned, answer this question. And what has *the Church*—what have *the Laity* been doing all this time? Alas, Sir, has it not been with them, as one of old lamented in a somewhat similar case—

"Delirant reges, plectuntur achiwi?"

Well, by God's blessing, it shall be so no more. The laity are awaking—may they indeed awake! Our rulers on the Episcopal bench, who know and feel their danger, as well as that of their brethren in a common household of faith, would rejoice to have their hands strengthened; and nothing, I am persuaded, would do this more effectually than a loud voice issuing from the laity, to tell these, their spiritual overseers, that they are alive to their danger. Let such a voice be raised—and where can it be heard with more thrilling effect, in Ireland at least, than from Protestant, independent Ulster!

While speaking thus, Sir, of my lay brethren, I would not be understood as excluding those who are so in another, though not less intimate sense—I mean *the inferior Clergy*. Many, thank God, very many of these are ready to respond to such a call. Let any such, who is awake and at his post, be addressed by those over whom it is his awful but blessed privilege to preside, by the too applicable appeal—"Watchman what of the night?" And will he not answer? I say unhesitatingly he will. If, then, this curse and plague of our sister-island have indeed, here or elsewhere in Ireland, made its ill-omened appearance—if a cloud of this kind, though but as a man's hand, threaten to pour down a blight on our moral and spiritual prosperity—let the effectual fervent prayers of all, clergy and laity, arise to the Throne of Grace, and along with this, let their united voice of determinate disapproval, and unswerving protest, be raised, loud enough to reach every ear, and by God's blessing it shall be dissipated.—I remain, &c,

LETTER XIX.

"THE LAY MEMORIAL."

SIR,—Scripture asserts, with its own unerring truth, "he that believeth shall not make haste;" and I have endeavoured to take this implied rule for my guidance, in a matter which deeply concerns, not alone myself, but the cause of true religion, previously to my thus once more addressing you. I allude to the Lay Memorial on the subject of the Church Architecture Society, lately presented to the Lord Bishop of these dioceses, and his Lordship's answer.

Several parties are concerned in these documents, now before the public. The Laity are the principal, and, as such, I have given way to their prior claim in noticing his Lordship's reply to their respectful address. Whether the gentry, merchants, yeomen, and *the* nobleman who headed them, as memorialists, feel satisfied with the result or not, remains to be proved, although, indeed, their feelings on the occasion may even already be tolerably well ascertained.

It is now quite evident that his Lordship did not know who the persons were, whose conduct and address he felt it his duty to receive and characterise with "grief," "disgust," and "reprobation," &c. &c. Time will tell whether these have been duly merited, or, I will add, with submission to superior judgment, wisely bestowed. We shall, perhaps, at no very distant period, see the effects which the treatment of this Memorial will have on our Diocesan Societies, into whose treasury, unless I greatly err, we shall hardly soon again see thousands of pounds flowing from the willing and confiding men whose names appear attached to the document in question.

There is, however, another party not slightly concerned, and who is alluded to in the following passage of his Lordship's answer:—

"But there is one paramount consideration, which prohibits me from being instrumental to the dissolution of our Church Architecture Society:—For many weeks that society has been the object of false and slanderous accusations, of insults and revilings from certain assailants, especially from one who, masking himself under a general designation, which he has disgraced by his unclerical and unchristian conduct under its protection, has scrupled not to villify and denounce the society in the face of the public; and from others who have vauntingly proclaimed, that it must and shall be dissolved. The essential question, therefore, in my mind, is become one quite distinct from the merits of the society itself. It is one of ecclesiastical discipline. It is a question, whether a Bishop, in the discharge of his office, is to have the liberty of following his own conscientious judgment, or to be placed under the dictation and the ban of any of his clergy who may take it upon himself to say—'This shall be or this shall not be done;' or we will raise the Laity against the Bishop. This phrase, gentlemen and brethren, is no figure of speech of mine: this project is not of my fiction or imagination."

Now, Sir, unless I, as well as others, am very much deceived, the

person alluded to here is your own correspondent, who has the privilege of now addressing you; it cannot, therefore, be thought unreasonable, if I claim some further indulgence, while I notice the above observations.

Permit me to say, in the first place, that I do so with regret. The question at issue before the public, I conceived to be one of general interest. I took it up originally, and in all my communications to yourself, handled it on general grounds, avoiding all personal allusion to his Lordship, unless when imperative necessity demanded it, and, even then, never forgetting the respect due to his office. My letters will testify to this. I do, therefore, deeply regret that his Lordship has seen it fit to descend to the columns of a public journal to treat with any individual circumstanced as I, of necessity, am—the more especially, as it leaves me but one alternative—either to submit to what I conceive to be most unworthy treatment, or to reply as I now do.

I can, of course, have no controversy with his Lordship as to the “paramount” nature of the “consideration” with which his strictures on me commence. Admitting that his apprehensions of my conduct were correct, it is a matter purely for prudential consideration, whether my transgressions are justly to be visited on the body of the laity who constitute the memorialists, and whether their prayer should be rejected in the manner it has been on my account. With what follows, however, I have much to do.

As to my adopting a “general designation” in these communications, I have only to say I am as yet quite unconvinced of the impropriety of such a course. I fancy his Lordship may find that others of his clergy do likewise; and if my misdemeanour lies in my taking an opposite side in the great question under consideration, I must only lie under the imputation of guilt. I have, however, the consolation of knowing, that neither you, Sir, nor the Memorialists, nor the great body of my brethren of the Laity, think that I have greatly erred in the view I have taken. A still more grievous charge follows, namely, that of “slandrous accusations,” “insults and revilings,” against the Church Architecture Society. I think, Sir, it must strike your readers that these terms, as well as the accusations contained in them, are very similar to the Archidiaconal address with which I was some time since honoured. I have, therefore, no resource but to treat them in a similar manner. I plead not guilty to every item in these serious charges. I deny them all. My letters are still in existence; I challenge any one of their statements to be proved incorrect—I submit any argument therein advanced, to the opinion of every candid enquirer after truth, in the matter at issue. I protested, and do still protest against the parent Camden Society, as an anti-Protestant institution, savouring, or rather embodying, all the conditions and high-church impertinences of Oxford semi-Popery. Just let us wait the decision of those gentlemen who have undertaken to examine it—those who have been *at length* appointed as a sub-committee of the Diocesan branch Society, for this purpose; whether they agree with me in my views of the Camden Society or not, its papers are before me, and its proceedings not unknown; and I venture to promise you such further exposition of both, God willing, if there be further need, as shall be quite sufficient to enlighten our Protestant fellow-subjects concerning Ecclesiologism.

His Lordship further alludes to certain threats of "raising the Laity against the Bishop;" of these I am quite ignorant. Perhaps if his Lordship had vouchsafed more distinct information on this head, the charge had been more tangible; in its present shape I have nothing to say to it. If his Lordship alludes to hearsay evidence, it is but fair to state that rumours certainly exist among us. I would be slow, however, to believe that any of our Church's chief overseers would submit to receive information on such terms. However necessary and honourable that office may be which bears the appropriate designation of "*oculus Episcopi*," I would hope such officials as might be designated "*ures episcoporum*" may not be either required or adopted.

The *gravamen*, however, of these accusations is, that I have "*disgraced*" my assumed designation, by "unclerical and unchristian conduct." For the determination of the accuracy of the charges herein contained, I am content to await the decision of another tribunal. I do deeply feel, that, in the business in hand, as well as in every other wherein I have been, or ever shall be engaged, human sin and frailty have their certain share. Yet, through God's grace, I shall venture to abide the sentence which my conduct may meet in this matter at His own righteous hands. I have conscientiously opposed, and so long as opportunity is afforded me, shall continue to do so, every effort, however innocently or undesignedly made, for introducing amongst my brethren of the Protestant Established Church, any institution which even remotely savours of those false doctrines and teachers, whose evil ways are now so manifest elsewhere. If to do this, in the estimation of any, be to forfeit my title to a minister of the Gospel, or a believer in its Divine Author, I am most willing to bear even this reproach, for His name's sake. I remain, Sir, yours truly, &c.

A P P E N D I X.

TO THE RIGHT REVEREND THE LORD BISHOP

OF

DOWN AND CONNOR AND DROMORE.

The Memorial of the undersigned Lay Members of the Established Church of England and Ireland, in the United Diocese of Down and Connor and Dromore,

RESPECTFULLY SHEWETH,

THAT we are warmly and firmly attached to the Church, of which your Lordship is a chief overseer;—we venerate and would uphold her in all her offices, discipline, ordinances, and doctrine, from a persuasion that they are in accordance with the Word of God.

That the Clergy and Laity of the United Diocese have, for a long period, lived together in amity and mutual confidence, more particularly during the last four years, in which it pleased Almighty God pre-eminently to bless their united exertions, for the extension of the Redeemer's cause, making the Diocese second to none in these kingdoms, for union and usefulness.

That we are thankful to the Great Head of the Church, for the signal blessings conferred on us and on our brethren in a common faith, by means of the Down and Connor Church Accommodation Society, over which your Lordship so efficiently presided, but which has now, to our great regret, virtually ceased to exist.

That we heartily desire and hope for the speedy formation of another society, similar, in all essential points, to one which has been made the instrument of so much good.

That we have perceived with alarm and apprehension, for some time back, the rapid spread of the false doctrines upheld and promulgated in the "Tracts for the Times," a series of publications emanating from Oxford, where so many of our Clergy are educated, and the heretical tendency of which needs but little comment in a document such as this, especially as addressed to your Lordship.

That, while we regard it as a cause of thankfulness, that these doctrines have made small progress, if any, in Ireland, we yet feel bound to testify to your Lordship our increased alarm at the introduction into these Dioceses of a Society for the ostensible purpose of Church Architecture, in connexion with one of a similar character in England—the Cambridge Camden Society—the existence and proceedings of

which latter institution have too manifest and painful a connexion with the errors and doctrines already referred to.

That we have reason to believe the apprehension arising from the introduction of such innovations amongst us, through this Institution, has already operated most unfavourably, in impairing the effects, and impeding the further progress, of that valuable Society—the Church Accommodation—to which we have already alluded; and our firm conviction is, that the same evil effects will be speedily and fatally felt, in paralysing the operations of our other Diocesan Institutions.

That, influenced by these considerations, we earnestly and respectfully entreat of your Lordship to take such steps, by withdrawing your countenance from the Church Architecture Society in these Dioceses, or by any other means which your better judgment may suggest, as will relieve our minds, and those of our poorer brethren, from these doubts and fears, which at present harass and distress us, and thereby enable us to act, as we desire to do, heart and hand with our Ministers, in endeavouring to promote the glory of God, and the good of our fellow-men.

[It may be interesting to state that the foregoing Memorial, although but three days in process of signature, throughout the united Dioceses, had affixed to it (as printed in the *Belfast Commercial Chronicle*, of February 4, 1843) upwards of 1300 signatures; many more should have been added, but were either late, or, in error, omitted. Of the names, as appearing in print, there was one of a Peer of the realm, and one of a Member of Parliament; besides *eleven* Deputy Lieutenants, and 40 Justices of the Peace. The remaining signatures were those of persons in all grades of society—from among members of the legal and medical professions, as well as private gentlemen, merchants and bankers, as, also, traders, artisans, mechanics, and the yeomen of the province. It may safely be said that double or treble the number might easily have been procured, did time permit, or the occasion require. The Memorial was presented to his Lordship by a Deputation, consisting of Colonel J. R. WARD, CONWAY DOBBS, Esq. then High Sheriff; and W. G. JOHNSON, Esq. late M.P. for Belfast.]

ANSWER OF THE BISHOP OF DOWN AND CONNOR AND DROMORE

TO THE MEMORIAL OF CERTAIN LAY MEMBERS OF THE UNITED
CHURCH OF ENGLAND AND IRELAND, IN THE DIOCESE OF
DOWN AND CONNOR AND DROMORE.

GENTLEMEN AND BRETHREN,—To your memorial, dated Belfast, January the 30th, 1843, and conveyed to me by Colonel Ward, as your Chairman, and a deputation appointed for the purpose, I have hastened to give my earnest attention. The subject of it has long

engaged my deepest solicitude. But to answer anonymous calumniators has been morally impossible; nor could I enter into controversy with those, who, connected with me by professional obligation, had thrown off the respect due to my office. With a number of respectable gentlemen, however, who come before me with a frank expression of their sentiments, and a request to be made acquainted with mine, it is a pleasure, as it is my duty, to communicate; and the language in which the memorial is couched is a pledge that my answer will be received with becoming attention, and weighed with careful deliberation.

At the same time I must not conceal from you my grief and disgust at certain circumstances connected with the memorial—circumstances, in which I firmly believe not one of you, Gentlemen, who are here present, has been a participator; and at which I confidently anticipate your concurrence in my language of reprobation. The circumstances I mean, first, of the diligence and activity wherewith the memorial has been circulated among all sorts and conditions of men throughout the diocese, and suffrages have been canvassed for and solicited, as if the object to be attained were the carrying of a contested popular election by a mere numerical majority of clamorous voices, instead of the cautious examination and reasonable decision of grave religious questions by cultivated and well-informed intellects; and then, the circumstance of the quality of many of the persons whose names are affixed to the memorial—persons disqualified by their age, and habits, and station in life, and defective knowledge—rather, I may say, by their utter ignorance—of the points in question, for forming a proper judgment concerning them; many of whom, I have reason to believe, have placed their signatures to a document, with the very purport and general contents of which they were unacquainted; and many under the supposition that they were bearing their testimony in favour of sentiments, not only different from, but totally opposed to, those which are now put forward with the weighty recommendation of their approval. Gentlemen of the deputation, I repeat my conviction, that you are incapable of having lent your respectable names to such unworthy stratagems. But holding in such estimation, as I do, the means which I believe to have been used for swelling the catalogue of subscriptions to this memorial, I cannot but express my disdain; and, at the same time, I frankly avow, that a belief of the circumstances which I have specified, is far from producing, on my mind, the effect which the contrivers no doubt calculated on producing by so long a list of memorialists. But I crave your indulgence for these preliminary reflections, and I now proceed to the memorial itself, which I purpose to notice paragraph by paragraph in succession.

1.—Your declaration, that you are warmly and firmly attached to the Church, and that you venerate and would uphold her in all her offices, discipline, ordinances, and doctrine, from a persuasion that they are in accordance with, and based upon, the “Word of God,” is received by me with the most cordial gratification. From persons who thus describe themselves in an address to one whom they represent as a “chief overseer” of the Church, it is an additional assurance that he will experience from them that support which is due to the sacredness of his office.

2.—The “amity and mutual confidence,” which, under God’s blessing, have heretofore prevailed between the clergy and laity of this diocese, is with me an occasion of perpetual thankfulness to God. And I see, for my own part, no reason why those kindly feelings should not be continued, if an attempt be made to abate the temporary agitation by mutual charity and benevolence.

3.—Among special causes of thankfulness to the Almighty, the Church Accommodation Society has, for the last four years, had in my thoughts a peculiar prominence; and, next to Almighty God, I have never failed of expressing my sense of gratitude to those who have assisted in promoting the objects of that Society. The recent cessation of the Society was contemplated, I think, at its formation, as intended to take place at a certain period, with a view to which the Society was originally framed. In its cessation, however, I am happy to perceive a prospect of its revival on similar principles, although with some difference of constitution and regulations, as recommended by past experience.

4.—In pursuance of a resolution passed at a meeting of the late Society, in January, 1842, the construction of a code of rules for a new Society was entrusted to a Committee of Clergymen and Laymen, who were prepared to bring them forward on a late occasion, but were precluded by an interruption, to which I shall not make, at this time, any further allusion. Whenever it shall be deemed proper to convene the friends of the projected measure for the consideration and adoption of those regulations, I shall gladly give my personal attendance and assistance.

5.—The dissemination of the false doctrines to which you advert, as upheld and promulgated in the “Tracts for the Times,” reasonably excites apprehension and alarm in the intelligent and conscientious members of our Reformed Church. Since her purification, three centuries ago, her welfare has been more or less impeded by the pertinacious hostility and artifices of Popery, under a variety of aspects. Against the Romish corruptions, I have again and again raised my voice—from my Cathedral seat, as well as in the pulpit, and by the press—in charges to my clergy, as well as in sermons and in other publications. Against that modified form of Popery to which you advert, I also have not been wanting in bearing my testimony. In a letter addressed to the noble Marquis who presided at the Church Accommodation Society’s meeting, in 1842, I noticed the prevailing disposition “to revert to the once bygone fancies of Romish superstition, and thence to bring forward obsolete notions and practices which, in common with others from the same repository of error, the Church had disallowed and repudiated;” and in a Charge which I addressed to my Clergy, in the last summer, I enlarged upon that sentiment, and successively impressed upon them cautions, “not to deviate from our National Church, by adopting any guide to faith or practice, other than that of Holy Scripture, which the Church herself acknowledges and prescribes”—“in our extreme reverence and affection for the Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church of Christ at large, not to abate the feelings, and restrict the conduct of dutiful respect which becomes us in relation to our national branch of it,”—“not, out of a fond respect for the bygone usages of antiquity, to infringe the duty

which we owe to our National Church, in a faithful observance of her ordinances, and of her ordinances only;”—“not to adopt a rule for the interpretation of the Articles of the Church, so as to impose upon them a sense different from that which they were originally intended to, and do properly bear;”—finally, “to abstain from the use of all such language as may tend to indicate in our own minds, or to implant in others, an indifference to the errors and corruptions of the Romish Church, and to encourage, on the other hand, a favourable contemplation of her, by putting forward and commending her better qualities, and by obscuring and keeping out of sight her peculiar abominations.” I need hardly remind you, gentlemen, that these several cautions, expanded into various particulars, were directed against some of those false doctrines which you have lamented as being promulgated by the “Tracts for the Times.”

6.—I agree with you in regarding it as a cause of thankfulness, that these doctrines have made small progress, if any, in Ireland; though a strict adherence to the principles and rules of the Church has unreasonably exposed some of our most respectable Clergy to the imputation of befriending them. Of those, indeed, of the clerical body who are inclined to deviate from the Church, the tendency is rather to anti-episcopal, anti-liturgical, anti-ritual, and irregular zeal. Meanwhile, “the introduction into these Dioceses of a Society for the ostensible purpose of Church Architecture,” need not excite in you the slightest alarm, for its “ostensible purpose” is its real one; and it has in truth, no occult or secret design, however the contrary be insinuated by the epithet, which, in Christian charity, I suppose to have been incautiously rather than deliberately, used. As to the Cambridge Camden Society, there is a sensitiveness in your minds in which I confess my backwardness to participate; nor do I perceive that, as you express yourselves, “the existence and proceedings of this latter institution have too manifest and painful a connection with the errors and doctrines already referred to.” Admitting, however, that there may be indiscretions and improprieties in some sentiments promulgated by persons connected with that Society, I do not admit that other societies connected with it, or even all of its own members, are implicated in the charge. The general and principal objects of the Society may be approved without implying a concurrence, as either required by itself, or conceded by others, with every particular proposition put forward, either individually or collectively, by its members: and for the sake of the general benefits, which it has rendered, and is rendering to the community, a generous spirit will be disposed to overlook a few partial errors. “If it have committed any errors,” as forcibly stated by a right reverend member of the English Episcopal Bench, in his willing, or, in his own emphatical language, his “more than willing” acceptance of the office of patron in the very last month, “if it have committed any errors, they are but as dust in the balance, when set against the good which it has done, and is likely to do.”

The connection of our Church Architecture Society with the Cambridge Camden Society appears to be not well understood. Although we may be popularly called a “branch of that Society,” we are not such in reality—we derive not from it support or sustenance. We are an integral Society of ourselves, altogether independent of it, as well as

of the other Architectural Societies with which we have formed, or may form, a connection—those, namely, of Bristol, Durham, Exeter, Lichfield, Oxford, and Yorkshire—a connection merely of mutual goodwill and kind offices. By this consideration my own conduct individually would be regulated; but, for the purpose of allaying any suspicion or jealousy in the minds of others, I would recommend our Society to cause a careful investigation to be made of the publications of the Cambridge Camden Society. If therein anything shall be found calculated to endanger our principles or to vitiate our practices, or to impeach our characters in the estimation of reasonable men, I would advise that a friendly remonstrance be addressed to the Cambridge Camden Society, distinctly indicating the objectionable passages, and temperately deprecating their continuance. Such a remonstrance, I have reason to think, would be favourably received. If we succeed in removing the offence, we shall have “gained our brethren;” if not, it will then be matter for our Society’s consideration what other course they may think proper to be pursued; and with that view I shall here simply observe, that as our connection with the Society arose out of a resolution of our own, so it is in our power to annul that resolution, and to sever the connexion. You will, however, I am sure, concur with me in opinion, that such a separation ought to be made, if made at all, after full consideration, on a deep conviction of its urgency, and with courtesy and brotherly kindness; and not without becoming respect to the many hundreds of the nobility, gentry, and dignitaries and parochial clergy of England who are enrolled among its members; to the several English Diocesan Societies which it holds in fellowship, all under the presidency of prelates, two of whom are of metropolitan station; and to the exalted personages whom the Society numbers among its patrons, namely—together with the Chancellor and the High Steward of the University of Cambridge, the Archbishops of Canterbury and Armagh, and eleven Bishops of the United Church of England and Ireland at home, and two Bishops of the Church in the Colonies, together with two of the Scottish Episcopal Church, and one of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America.

7.—If there be ground for the apprehension “of innovations being introduced amongst us” through this institution, and that such apprehension “has already operated unfavourably, in impairing the effects of the Church Accommodation Society, and may be expected to be felt in paralysing the operations of our other Diocesan institutions,” as you signify your belief; such evils appear to me most capable of remedy or counteraction, by a dispassionate investigation of their alleged origin, such as has been now recommended, but which has been hitherto precluded by the unmannerly and unchristian assaults to which the Society has been exposed, principally from nameless assailants.

8.—To relieve your minds, and those of my poorer brethren, from all harassing and distressing fears and doubts on these subjects, is my heart’s desire and prayer to Almighty God; and I shall most cheerfully co-operate with you, in contributing to bring about a consummation so devoutly to be wished. To withdraw my countenance, however, from the Church Architecture Society of this diocese, is a step which I cannot undertake; because I consider the Society calculated to improve our parochial churches, and make them more fit for the

service of Almighty God, by building or restoring them, as occasion may require, after a manner free from all admixture of superstition on the one hand, and distinguished from irreverent meagreness on the other, thus reflecting the character of the Church herself, and guided by her principles and rules; because I consider such a study to be worthy of every gentleman of liberal pursuits, and, forasmuch as it is calculated to produce God's honour, to be especially worthy of Christian gentlemen, and, most of all, of Christian ministers; because I consider it calculated to produce amongst us a generous spirit of more enlarged enquiry, and an acquaintance with the ecclesiastical antiquities and topography of the diocese, as likewise of other parts of the country, into which such enquiries may be propagated; because whilst in the prosecution of this, its innocent and beneficial, its blameless and praiseworthy career, the Society seeks to employ no other influence than such as may arise from a simple exposition of its character; to that liberty of judgment, of will, and of action, which it cheerfully concedes to others, it is itself also justly entitled, and because to abolish the Society, once instituted amongst us, would be to deprive the diocese of an useful acquisition, and to lay it open to merited animadversion and ridicule.

*But there is one paramount consideration, which prohibits me from being instrumental to the dissolution of our Church Architecture Society:—*For many weeks *that Society* has been the object of *false and slanderous accusations, of insults and revilings from certain assailants, especially from one, who, masking himself under a general designation, which he has disgraced by his unclerical and unchristian conduct, under its protection, has scrupled not to vilify and denounce the Society in the face of the public;* and from others who have vauntingly proclaimed, that it must and shall be dissolved. The essential question, therefore, in my mind is become one quite distinct from the merits of the Society itself. It is one of *ecclesiastical discipline*. It is a question whether a *Bishop, in the discharge of his office*, is to have the *liberty of following his own conscientious judgment, or to be placed under the dictation and the ban of any of his clergy who may take it upon himself to say,—“This shall be or this shall not be done;”* or, *we will raise the Laity against the Bishop*. This phrase, gentlemen and brethren, is no figure of speech of mine: this project is not of my fiction or imagination. How far the present movement may have arisen out of this notable and dutiful device, I have not the means of judging; but thus circumstanced, I am bound by a sense of duty to the Church Architecture Society, to yourselves, likewise, gentlemen and brethren, to the diocese in general, to the Church at large, and in all, to the Great Head and guardian of the Church, not to suffer my office to be thus depreciated, insulted, set at naught, and trampled on by a subordinate Minister. At the head of your list of memorialists stands the honourable name of a most respected military officer. He cannot but be alive to the fatal consequences of the superior being thus made subject to the arrogant dictation of an inferior. But no one of you, I am persuaded, pledging yourselves as you do to “uphold the Church in all her offices, discipline, and ordinances,” would desire to see one, whom you recognise as a “chief overseer of the Church,” thus divested of the attributes of his office.

An alternative, however, is happily supplied by the terms of your

entreaty, that I will relieve your minds “by any other means which my better judgment may suggest.” Thankfully acknowledging the courtesousness of your reference, and beseeching and trusting to the blessing of God for the success of my answer, I would say to you in the first place—Put confidence in your Bishop. For almost twenty years he has resided among you, and God is his witness that, during those years, he has watched for your spiritual welfare, and has laboured “to have in all things a conscience void of offence towards God and towards man.” Why should it be supposed that he is now the institutor, or advocate, of measures inimical to the welfare of the Church committed to his charge? Secondly, look with charity and brotherly love upon your brethren, whether of the Clergy or of the Laity, who are associated with your Bishop in the present undertaking. Are they—is any one of them—justly chargeable with superstition, or Popery, or any approach towards it, or any deviation in the way of Rome, from their duty to God and to his Church? With such offences, indeed, they have been charged. But all those charges will, on enquiry, I doubt not, prove as fallacious as have those concerning the parish in which I reside, and concerning several others in the neighbourhood, that lighted candles are placed on the communion tables, for celebrating the order of morning prayer in our churches. Thirdly, acquaint yourselves by your own observation—by the testimony of your own senses—with the proceedings of the Church Architecture Society. Be not misled by “the ignorance of foolish men,” but see with your own eyes, and hear with your own ears, what the Society is doing, and let your own senses be the judges. On Tuesday, the 7th of this month, the Society is to hold its first quarterly meeting. After the admission of new members, it is the President’s purpose to submit to the assembly a paper in exposition and exemplification of an important principle of Ecclesiastical Architecture; and other papers, accompanying and descriptive of presents to the Society, will then, in due course, be read. We have no secrets to conceal; there is no inspection from which we shrink. Come among us, any of you that please; come and be fellow-members, if you are satisfied with the character of our institution; come as visitors, if you prefer it, for as such you will be welcomed, on being introduced by a member, in accordance with the Society’s rules. If in any thing, either then or at any other time, we appear to neglect our pledge of abstaining “from all admixture of superstition,” admonition will, I am sure, be thankfully received, and correction carefully administered. But do not condemn us on partial representations, unseen, unheard, and unknown. Rather give us credit for being what we profess to be, and nothing more: and anxious as we are, and from the beginning have been, to avoid all cause of offence to others, suffer us to act according to our own judgments, and pursue our path in peace.

Brethren, I commit you, in conclusion, to the blessing of God Almighty; humbly beseeching him to “grant that the course of this world may be so peaceably ordered by his governance, that his Church may joyfully serve him in all godly quietness, through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.”—Your faithful servant, and affectionate brother in Christ,

RD. DOWN AND CONNOR AND DROMORE.

ADDRESS.

THE Committee of the Lay Members of the United Church of England and Ireland, who have signed the Memorial to the Lord Bishop of Down and Connor and Dromore, dated the 30th of January, 1843, by the unexpected publication, by his Lordship (in the *Ulster Times* of the 2d of February), of their Memorial, without any of its signatures, and of his own reply, with the weight of his name attached, feel called on to publish these documents in full; and as this subject, which it was their intention should, for the present, have been confined to a respectful address from them to their Bishop, has been thus brought before the public, they consider it right to take this opportunity of making a few brief observations considered necessary by the occasion.

It is a source of satisfaction to the Committee that the language, at least, in which the Memorial is couched, has met the approbation of his Lordship; and it is their desire, by God's grace, that, in these further remarks, they should not be led to forget, either what is due to the Lord Bishop of these Dioceses, or to themselves, as Lay Members of the Church. They cannot, however, but deeply regret, that his Lordship should have considered this a befitting occasion for animadverting upon the conduct of any of his Clergy, when replying to a prayer of the Laity.

The Lord Bishop received the deputation graciously, and, after hearing the Memorial, favoured them by reading his *ready-written answer*; which, therefore, must have been prepared previous to his Lordship's being in possession, either of the signatures to the Memorial, or the names of the individuals by whom it was presented. In this answer he expressed his "grief" and "*disgust*" at certain circumstances connected with the procuring of the signatures attached to the Memorial, while he acquits every gentleman of the deputation of having any participation in such measures.

The deputation, and the other members of the Committee, cannot avail themselves of this acquittal. They hold themselves responsible to his Lordship and the public for the manner in which the Memorial has been prepared, signed, and presented. They feel warranted in stating, in the strongest terms, their conviction, that the information which had been communicated to his Lordship on this subject must have been inaccurate.

In closing the labours which have been involuntarily, on their part, or rather, they would humbly trust, providentially devolved upon them, the Committee may be allowed to express their disappointment at the failure of the object of their Memorial, evidenced by the continued existence of that society among them; as to the nature of which, their fears, they must declare, are unabated, and their objections unremoved. The case of themselves, as well as their brethren who were united with them in the Memorial, is now before the public; and the characters of the Memorialists will, it is hoped, answer

for themselves. The Lord Bishop of these Dioceses has been the first to place it there; and the Committee feel no unwillingness thus to leave it to be disposed of accordingly. In following his Lordship's example, and giving the documents in full to the public press, they conceive they have but performed a duty to themselves. They can conscientiously declare, that in their intercourse with all the parties concerned—at every adjourned meeting for consultation, as well as that for receiving, through the deputation, his Lordship's answer—but one spirit pervaded all who were at any time present. The Committee would hope, that the tone and character of the documents now presented to the public will sufficiently testify as to what that spirit has been. It is true they had to encounter wounded feelings, and disappointed expectations, but in no one instance, as they trust, has the result been unbecoming the character of the persons thus dealt with, either as Churchmen or Christians. To this joint statement of the Committee and Deputation, they have but to add the fervent hope, that in all ulterior measures which any connected with them may feel called upon, individually or collectively, to adopt, the same spirit of Christian meekness and wisdom may prevail.

The Committee feel warranted in declaring, that they have come to the matter in hand, neither under the undue influence of any individual, nor without careful consideration of, and acquaintance with, the subject of their memorial. They have but to add their heartfelt prayer, that the Disposer of all events may overrule and guide whatever has occurred, in this matter, to His own glory, the good of His Church, and the advancement of true religion amongst us.

RESOLUTIONS

PASSED at a Meeting of a number of the Subscribers to the Memorial to the Lord Bishop of Down and Connor and Dromore, held in Belfast, on Friday, 3d of February;

COLONEL WARD, J.P. IN THE CHAIR.

The Report of the Committee having been read and unanimously approved of, it was then

Moved by CONWAY R. DOBBS, Esq. Castle Dobbs; and seconded by J. D. R. CLEALAND, Esq. Rathgael House, and resolved unanimously:—

1.—“That we desire to express our gratification at the Bishop's recognition of the respectful language and spirit of our Memorial.”

Moved by WM. G. JOHNSON, Esq.; seconded by THOS. GREG, Esq. Ballymenoch:—

2.—“That we cannot subscribe to the opinion expressed by his Lordship, that the subject brought before him in the Memorial is one on which the poorest member of the Church is not capable of ‘forming a proper judgment.’”

Moved by Professor STEVELLY; seconded by JAMES STANFIELD, Esq. :—

3.—“That the publication of the names of the subscribers affords his Lordship an opportunity of proving the grave charge, that the Committee had acted the part of ‘contrivers,’ or used unworthy means in obtaining signatures.”

Moved by JOHN BATES, Esq.; seconded by JOHN CLARKE, Esq. :—

4.—“That while we willingly re-echo his Lordship’s denunciation of Popery, and his censure of the Oxford Tracts (for which reference is made by him to his ‘Charges,’ &c.) we desire to be most explicit in our condemnation of the whole of these publications, *not excepting the earlier numbers*, whose tendencies have been amply exposed elsewhere: as also in our determination, by the grace of God, to detect and expose all attempts to introduce ‘obsolete notions and practices,’ alien to the well-known usages of Protestantism, and dangerous to the peace of our Church.”

Moved by Wm. WILSON, Esq.; seconded by EDWARD CLARKE, Esq. :—

5.—“That we deplore the continuance of the CHURCH ARCHITECTURE SOCIETY in these Dioceses, inasmuch as we still entertain well-grounded apprehensions of the evil tendency of any such Society, from what is now become a matter of notoriety with regard to its PARENT—the CAMBRIDGE CAMDEN SOCIETY.”

Moved by J. HIND, Esq.; seconded by Dr. H. PURDON :—

6.—“That having, previous to the preparation of our Memorial, acquainted ourselves with the objects of the Cambridge Camden Society, of which the Lord Bishop is a Patron, and from which the Church Architecture Society has emanated, we cannot anticipate any advantage from an examination being now made into the objects of the Camden Society, which examination should, in our opinion, have preceded the connexion of the Diocesan with the Parent Society; nor can we hope for any advantage from attending the meetings of the Diocesan Society, believing, as we do, that in the present state of the United Church of England and Ireland, the existence of either of these Societies endangers the cause of truth, and the peace of the Church.”

Moved by JAMES CRAWFORD, Esq.; seconded by J. B. SHANNON, Esq. :—

7.—“That thus taking into consideration the alternative offered, and the substantial rejection of the prayer of our Memorial, we feel constrained to express our sorrow at the failure of our effort, the design of which was solely the welfare of that Church to which we are attached. And, finally, we desire to commend the matter, thus taken in hand, to Him who ruleth all things in heaven and in earth, with our earnest prayer, that it may please Him to preserve, as well as to aid us in maintaining, pure and undefiled, the Religion of our REFORMED PROTESTANT CHURCH.”

Moved by JOHN BATES, Esq.; seconded by JOHN CLARKE, Esq.—

8.—That the warm Thanks of the meeting be expressed to the Editors of the *Chronicle*, for their able and disinterested services during the whole of the proceedings in this manner.

J. R. WARD, Chairman.

Col. WARD having left the Chair, and JAMES D. ROSE CLEALAND, Esq. having been called thereto, it was moved by WM. CAIRNS, Esq. :

“ That the warm and grateful thanks of this meeting be given to Colonel Ward, for his continued and efficient services in behalf of the object of the Memorialists ; as, also, to the members of the Deputation, for their kind co-operation.” Passed by acclamation.

JAS. D. ROSE CLEALAND, Chairman.

PAPERS OF THE CAMBRIDGE CAMDEN SOCIETY.

FURTHER reference to these very objectionable documents may seem useless : a few, however, in confirmation of the views expressed in the foregoing letters, may be here appended.

With reference to the frequently-denied connexion of the Down and Connor Society, we find the following, *Ecclesiologist*, vol. 1, p. 180 :—

“ We have great pleasure in announcing the formation of a branch of our Society in the united Diocese of Down, Connor, and Dromore, under the sanction and auspices of the Venerable Prelate who presides in that See. We hope that this may be the first step to an effective renovation of the fabricks of the Church in Ireland.”

The mischievous nature of this, the parent Institution, might have, easily and early, been seen. Thus, in November, 1841, and in the 2d No. of the *Ecclesiologist*, we find the *withdrawal of the Bishop of London's name* from the list of Patrons, on the ground of objections to one of its tracts ; and, at the same time, the following *protest*, signed by twelve influential members—one a vice-president of the Society—was submitted :—

“ We, the undersigned, Members of the Cambridge Camden Society feel ourselves compelled to remonstrate with the Committee on the character of a paper which appeared in their recent publication, ‘ The *Ecclesiologist*.’ The subject of the paper referred to is the church now nearly completed in New Town ; and its object appears to be to throw ridicule not only on that church, but on every similar attempt to supply the religious destitution of our overgrown population. The flip-pant tone in which this paper is written, appears to us singularly offensive. The following sentence may serve as a specimen—‘ As the Altar is not yet put up, and, *probably, not yet thought of*, we cannot say where it will be placed : *indeed, we are inclined to fear that it has been forgotten altogether.*’

“ Fully convinced as we are of the benefits which the taste for architecture, fostered by the Camden Society in those who are to be our future parochial Clergy, may be the means of conferring upon the Church, we feel the more regret at observing such attempts as these to

give a party character to its publications. We fear from this and other indications, that there exists in some quarters a desire to convert the Society into an engine of polemical theology, instead of an instrument for promoting the study and the practice of Ecclesiastical Architecture. We desire, therefore, to remind the Committee that it is their duty to guard against such a prostitution of its influence to purposes alien from its design. And we would beg them to remember, that as the objects of the Camden Society are co-extensive with the whole Church of England, and as its members are not confined to any particular party in the Church, it is therefore, in the highest degree improper that any school of religious belief which is by the Church permitted to exist within her body, should, in our publications, be spoken of with disrespect."

An examination of even one of this Society's publications—"*A Few Words to Church Builders*"—will show the novelties aimed at being introduced, as well as the exceedingly dangerous and superstitious devices recommended for use in our Churches. Thus, the *reading-pew* (or desk) is spoken of (p. 25.) as "nothing but a modern innovation, very ugly, very inconvenient, and *totally repugnant to all Catholic principles of devotion.*"

Again (p. 24.), "It is, I hope, hardly necessary to caution you against any approximation to a gallery." Forsooth, inasmuch as THE ALTAR may not be visible thence.

The Chancel or Nave "*are to be kept entirely separate*" (p. 20.)—"This," it is added, "is most effectually done by the *Roodscreen*, or as it would be more appropriately called, the Chancel-screen, *that most beautiful and Catholick appendage to the Church.*"

CHURCH ORNAMENTS.

"OF these we may mention the following:—

"The monogram IHC, or IHS.

"An AGNUS DEI.

"A pelican 'in her piety.'

"A nest of young eaglets, the old one hovering over them: an allusion to Deut. xxxii. 11.

"A boar rooting up a vine. Psalm lxxx. 11.

"A salamander. When found on a Font, this animal symbolizes the promise, 'HE shall baptise you with the HOLY GHOST, and with *fire*;' elsewhere it refers to Isaiah xliii. 2.

"The Crown of Thorns.

"The Instruments of Crucifixion.

"All kinds of Crosses; especially a Cross botonnée, a Cross pattée, a Cross raguly, a Cross potence, a Cross moline.

"The Crown of thorns surrounding IHC.

"A Chalice with Fruit.

"A hart drinking. Psalm xlii. 1.

“ Two doves drinking out of one pitcher : an emblem of the peace and joy arising from the reception of the Holy Eucharist. This is a very ancient symbol.

“ The Tree of Life, with Adam and Eve, and the serpent.

“ On one boss, a barren tree ; on the next, a tree in full bearing, swine generally revelling on the fallen fruit.

“ Our LORD in the ship (generally taken by the Fathers as a type of the Holy Church).

“ Bunches of grapes intermingled with wheat ears.

“ A Cross standing on a crescent.

“ A Rose and a Lily.

“ The Phoenix, which S. Clement adduces as a symbol of the Resurrection.

“ A lion rampant with the legend ‘ Vicit Leo de tribu Juda.’

“ A Lily terminating in a Cross.

“ *All these are strictly Catholick devices, and might well be employed now.*”

The foregoing is a sample of Ecclesiological taste : such as it is it may afford the reader an opportunity of judging whether the interference of “ *Clericus Connorensis*,” on the occasion which induced him to appear in public, was required or not ; as well as how far removed the opinions, and recommended usages, of such societies are, from that simplicity, which is among the highest adornments, and surest marks of the true religion of our Divine Redeemer.

